



1982

## John Ford's Theatre of Ceremony: A Formal Study of His Five Major Plays

Chikako D. Kumamoto  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kumamoto, Chikako D., "John Ford's Theatre of Ceremony: A Formal Study of His Five Major Plays" (1982). *Dissertations*. 2075.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/2075](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2075)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1982 Chikako D. Kumamoto

4-11)

JOHN FORD'S THEATRE OF CEREMONY:  
A FORMAL STUDY OF HIS FIVE MAJOR PLAYS

By  
Chikako D. Kumamoto

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
April  
1982

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my dissertation committee, Professors Anthony LaBranche, Suzanne Gossett, Bernard McElroy, and James Rocks, whose wisdom, knowledge, and goodwill were an invaluable help, and whose dedication to scholarship was a constant source of inspiration to me. They supported my efforts, on and off the campus, with patience, understanding, and intellectual precision which mark the core of their professional and humanistic concerns. I respectfully extend to them my permanent and deepest gratitude.

I also wish to express my appreciation to Professor John Shea who has guided and encouraged my graduate studies throughout my stay at Loyola.

Finally I wish to thank my parents and my husband, Steven, without whose trust and care my efforts could not have been completed.

## LIFE

The author, Chikako Daishin Kumamoto, is the daughter of Toshio Daishin and Mitsue (Fujii) Daishin. She was born June 3, 1940, in Shinkyō, Manchuria.

Her elementary education was obtained in the public schools in Hiroshima, Japan, and secondary education at Notre Dame Immaculate Heart High School, Hiroshima, Japan, where she graduated in 1959.

From 1959 to 1963, she attended Notre Dame Immaculate Heart University, Okayama, Japan, where she received a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in English in 1963. From 1963 to 1965, she attended Hiroshima University in Hiroshima, Japan, where she received a Master of Arts degree in English in 1965.

In 1965, she was awarded a Fulbright scholarship to study at Marquette University, where she graduated with a Master of Arts degree in English in 1967.

In January, 1976, she was formally admitted to Loyola's Ph.D. program in English as a part-time student. She completed her doctoral course work in December, 1979.

Ms. Kumamoto is married and lives in Glenview, Illinois, with her husband, Steven Y. Kumamoto.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIFE . . . . .	iii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. INQUIRY INTO THE CONCEPT OF CEREMONY. .	10
Historical Circumstances . . . . .	10
Puritan Objection to Ceremony . . .	10
Anglican Defense of Ceremony . . .	30
Ceremony and Drama . . . . .	52
III. JOHN FORD AND CEREMONY . . . . .	68
IV. THE LOVER'S MELANCHOLY . . . . .	93
V. THE BROKEN HEART . . . . .	141
VI. 'TIS PITY SHE'S A WHORE . . . . .	191
VII. LOVE'S SACRIFICE . . . . .	241
VIII. PERKIN WARBECK . . . . .	295
IX. SOME CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	350
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	370

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Since the recovery of John Ford's works by the Victorians in the nineteenth century, the plays of Ford have been the center of considerable critical debate. A review of Ford criticism presents, however, a relationship similar to that which Whitehead remarked between Western philosophy and Plato: just as Western philosophy has been a series of footnotes to Plato, the criticism of Ford has long been a series of footnotes on the nature of Ford's morality. While Ford has become increasingly popular as one of the most widely read of English Renaissance dramatists, his critics have focused their thoughts on his assumed moral cast, by labelling Ford by turns a "high priest of decadence," a traditional moralist, or a scientific amoralist.<sup>1</sup>

Some forty years ago, Joan Sargeaunt posed an important question which led to a now recognizably valid approach

---

<sup>1</sup>For the history of Ford criticism, see the following: Wallace A. Bacon, "The Literary Reputation of John Ford," Huntington Library Quarterly, 11 (1947-48): 181-199; D. K. Anderson, John Ford (New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1972), pp. 133-142; Joan Sargeaunt, John Ford (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), pp. 167-187.

to Ford's plays. After surveying the critical disagreements among the critics, she asked: "What has Apollo to do with Christ?"<sup>2</sup> By posing this question, Sargeaunt pointed out the danger for any critic who chooses to dictate on moral grounds to Ford what subjects or modes of treatment he must undertake. More significantly her question was a warning against the separation between moral and aesthetic judgments -- a separation to which Ford's plays are particularly susceptible. Recent Ford critics have heeded her counsel well. They have ceased to judge Ford's plays simply in terms of the characters' abnormal psychology, of dramatically incredible situations, or to charge Ford with moral decadence and sensationalism. Instead, they have begun to concentrate on Ford's dramaturgy, so as to unify his ethical views and his artistic executions. In order to see Ford more clearly, they have begun to examine Ford within the Jacobean and Caroline ethos, and to explain the modes of dramatic expression appropriate to Ford's ideas and themes

---

<sup>2</sup>

Sargeaunt, p. 184.

in his plays.<sup>3</sup>

It is with Sargeaunt's query and the recent critical trend in mind that I shall investigate Ford's use of ceremony in his five major plays: The Lover's Melancholy, The Broken Heart, 'Tis Pity She's a Whore, Love's Sacrifice and Perkin Warbeck. Some immediate critical benefits can be gained from applying ceremony to Ford's plays. First, this approach allows me to see Ford in relation to his own era. As my second chapter will show in detail, ceremony was a highly controversial subject in early seventeenth century England. The term was disputed by the people, simultaneously drawing them into the religious, political and theatrical areas. This historical fact corroborates my assumption about Ford's awareness of his social and intellectual environment, and particularly about his awareness of ceremony as a formal pattern of drama.

---

<sup>3</sup>Some critics who seek after Ford's dramatic art are: Russell Fraser, "Elizabethan Drama and the Art of Abstraction," Comparative Drama, 2 (1968): 73-82; James Howe, "Ford's The Lady's Trial: A Play of Metaphysical Wit," Genre, 7 (1974): 342-361; R. J. Kaufmann, "Ford's Tragic Perspective," Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 1 (1960): 522-537; B. Morris, "Introduction" to The Broken Heart (London: E. Benn, 1965), pp. xii-xxx; Michael Neill, "The Moral Artifice of The Lover's Melancholy," English Literary Renaissance, 8 (1978): 85-106; Jeanne A. Roberts, "John Ford's Passionate Abstractions," Southern Humanities Review, 7 (1973): 322-332.

Second, while the idea of ceremony enables me to place Ford in his time, it also enables me to shift from the examination of Ford's so-called morality that the old-line critics centered in decadence and sensationalism, to an effort to locate the formal centers of his dramaturgy. It has been recognized that ceremony is a useful term to describe part of Ford's plays. Critics such as Leech, Ornstein and Kirsch have referred to it in passing when describing those stylized gestures in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore or The Broken Heart.<sup>4</sup> Giovanni's appearance on centerstage with his sister's heart at the end of his dagger and Calantha's endurance of the news of the three deaths with silent dance are indeed ceremonialized, and these scenes are the most obvious instances worthy of note. What these critics have not pursued, however, it seems to me, is that in terms of Ford's dramaturgy, Giovanni's and Calantha's ceremonial postures are the crux of each play's meaning. These gestures of Giovanni and Calantha hold some of the keys which explain their inner natures and make important thematic statements. Instead of being merely empty spectacles and sensationalism of an extreme kind, their

---

<sup>4</sup>Clifford Leech, John Ford (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1964); Robert Ornstein, The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960), pp. 200-221; A. C. Kirsch, Jacobean Dramatic Perspectives (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1972), pp. 112-126.

stylized gestures finally draw up all the disparate elements of the plays, focus their ethical stances, and visualize, in an emblematically contracted way, the ultimate sense of paradox in the experiences of love and marriage.

These thoughts about ceremony direct me to my third observation about ceremony in relation to Ford's dramaturgy, an observation that ceremonial actions are not limited to those examples which I have remarked. I propose that in Ford's plays, there are many more crucial ceremonial and ceremonial-like actions and moments which seem to deserve further investigation. While the examples of Giovanni and Calantha offer Fordian dramatic prototypes of ceremonial expression in human conduct, they also seem capable of yielding a clearer direction toward defining the kind of dramatic form that Ford might have had in mind.

In the following chapters, I shall develop my ceremonial approach to Ford in three steps. My first step is to investigate ceremony as a historical circumstance by way of the controversy over ceremonial concepts and observances between the Anglicans and the Puritans. The polemic context is intended to explain the historical atmosphere which might have sharpened Ford's awareness of ceremony as a theatrical mode. At the same time, the controversy is examined so as to support my later assertion that ceremony is not only an expression of man's ethical ideality, but

also an expression of man's imagination and creativity. Although it is presented mainly from a religious perspective, the historical investigation of ceremony touches upon additional aspects which developed from the contemporary religious controversy and which will contribute to defining the ways in which I can relate ceremony to drama. Starting with the Elizabethan notion of ceremony, I shall cite the controversy over not only the ceremonies used in Church, but also those ceremonies and observances of the traditional folklore customs, which are closely related to the nature of drama.

My second step is a further consideration of how ceremony as a literary form can be applied to drama. The main thrust of this section is that ceremony creates an organizing formal order. By reexamining what the ceremonial controversy and the criticism of ceremony offer relative to drama, I shall describe what ceremony does and what values and attitudes it conveys. I shall also explore the formal ways in which ceremony relates to drama -- that is, the ways in which ceremony contributes to shaping the formal integrity of drama.

My final step is concerned with the specific analytic strategy I shall apply to Ford's plays. First I shall describe which traditional ceremonial situations and moments are applicable to Ford and in which formal ways ceremonial

moments and situations are created in his plays -- specially through controlling images, language and stage arrangements. This general statement offers a basis for my assertion that there are invariably two distinct ceremonial threads in Ford's plays. Ford's recurring interest is in his characters' experiences in love and marriage. Moreover, love and marriage are treated repeatedly in terms of how Ford's lovers deal with the betrothal and marriage ceremony. His first ceremonial thread forms the romantic plot -- whose activating circumstances and turning points are explained through the lovers' views and treatments of the betrothal and marriage ceremony. This ceremonial thread fixes in the minds of the audience a point of reference to the central action and a dramatic perspective upon the main love story. It also helps to define the lovers' problems and marks their developments and solutions of the problems.

It becomes apparent, however, that Ford also presents a causal chain of events which hints at something more than just emotional human situations. Besides telling his love stories in realistic detail, Ford is also interested in turning these love stories into a symbolic medium and in showing his cherished thoughts on ethical ideals and conducts. In order to clarify his additional purposes, Ford creates, in each of the five plays, a new or additional sense of ceremony -- a ceremonial thread more personally



conceived and therefore more urgent, yet more in harmony with his particular choice of values and ideas. Ford's second ceremonial thread is each play's narrative structure which is the sequence of diverse details we get in the form of seemingly gratuitous subplots, secondary characters, additional ceremonial events and scenes similar to those of marriage and betrothal. The second ceremonial thread (seemingly unrelated details) helps the first thread (the stories of the lovers) emerge in bold relief. It contributes to enhancing visually Ford's special sense of dramatic structure and his sense of ethical views. It functions as a contrast, a parallel, a complement, and a restatement of Ford's ethical interests, while it helps to define each play's movement and completion of the plot. What yokes the two threads is the design which appears as both controlling and cumulative images and rhetorical devices, such as the image of the heart in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore.

I shall analyze the five plays to demonstrate that the very essence of Ford's plays depends upon his understanding of the symbol-making and ceremony-acting tendencies inherent in human nature. Ford finds a highly visual style which depicts his ceremony-ridden characters and occasions with a formalized and spectacular art. Finally, his ceremonial theatre is his imaginative medium for the

thoughtful expression of these ethical ideals he contemplates for man.

## CHAPTER II

### INQUIRY INTO THE CONCEPT OF CEREMONY

#### I. HISTORICAL CIRCUMSTANCES

##### 1. The Puritan Objection to Ceremony.

C. L. Barber describes the importance of ceremonial observance, which shaped the various phases of Elizabethan society, in the following terms:

We can get hold of the spirit of Elizabethan holidays because they had form. "Merry England" was merry chiefly by virtue of its community observances of periodic sports and feast days. Mirth took form in morris-dances, sword-dances, wassailings, mock ceremonies of summer kings and queens and of lords of misrule, mummings, disguisings, masques--and a bewildering variety of sports, games, shows, and pageants improvised on traditional models. Such pastimes were a regular part of the celebration of a marriage, of the village wassail or wake, of Candlemas, Shrove Tuesday, Hocktide, May Day, Whitsuntide, Midsummer Eve, Harvest home, Halloween, and Twelfth Night. Custom prescribed, more or less definitely, some ways of making merry at each occasion. The seasonal feasts were not, as now, rare curiosities to be observed by folklorists in remote villages, but landmarks framing the cycle of the year, observed with varying degrees of sophistication by most elements in the society.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>C. L. Barber, Shakespeare's Festive Comedy (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1963), p. 5. Italics mine.

The observance of those holidays, not to mention the religious ceremonies which celebrated them, was banned by the Puritans in the late 1640's.

It was true that the controversy between the Anglicans and the Puritans over religious ceremony had been advancing ever since the Reformation under Henry VIII, but in the early seventeenth century the Puritan objections intensified and finally succeeded in discouraging not only religious ceremonies, but ceremony of all types. The significance of the ceremony controversy was that what started out as objections to religious ceremony extended to include all manner of traditional pastimes, such as festivals, games and play. These developments of religious controversy are important aspects of ceremony to remember when later I will consider what ceremony is all about in aesthetic terms.

The conflict of opinions concerning ceremony can be best seen in two opposing theories of Church worship. The one theory, which was adopted by the Puritans and became their devotional essence, is that "worship is a purely mental activity to be exercised by a strictly psychological 'attention' to a subjective emotional or spiritual experience."<sup>2</sup> It is a matter of the mind rather than of external

---

<sup>2</sup> Dom G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press, 1945), p. 312.

artifacts. The other theory, which was adopted by the Anglicans, advances the ceremonial concept of Church worship. That is, its "foundation principle is that worship as such is not a purely intellectual and affective exercise, but one in which the whole man - body as well as soul, his aesthetic and volitional as well his intellectual powers - must take full part. It regarded worship as an 'act' just as much as an 'experience.'"<sup>3</sup> At its best, the ceremonial worship, aided by external things and forms, encourages "the formation of habits . . . by surrounding the heart with the softening influence of external example."<sup>4</sup>

Against this theoretical background, the crux of the Puritan objections to ceremonial worship in seventeenth century England can be formulated as follows: the gradual

---

<sup>3</sup>Dix, p. 312.

<sup>4</sup>S. R. Gardiner, History of England (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1883-1884), volume 3, p. 243. For the summary of the controversial points of the Anglican liturgy, the following were consulted: G. J. Cuming, A History of Anglican Liturgy (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1969); S. R. Gardiner, History of England (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1883-1884), 10 volumes; D. E. W. Harrison, Common Prayer in the Church of England (London: S.P.C.K., 1969); E. W. Kirley, William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931); H. R. McAdoo, The Spirit of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century (London: Adam & Charles Black, c. 1965); J. F. New, Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640 (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964).

elaboration of Anglican worship brought with it the threat of formalism, a mere ecclesiastical ceremonial act displacing sincere surrender of the heart and will. The Puritans basically distrusted symbolic and imaginative formal embodiments of "a subjective emotional or spiritual experience." They regarded the various formal ways of worship - such as gestures, actions or symbolic artifacts of faith - as man-made things, deliberate fictions "by which a man assures other people rather than himself of his saving faith in Christ's redemption."<sup>5</sup> The kind of thinking that went into the Puritan objections centered not so much in their deliberate repudiation of beauty nor in their advocacy of plainness in worship for its own sake, as it centered in the way they wished to form and express their religious experiences. I may term it the Puritan sensibility. It held that the deliberate Anglican invention of symbolic gestures and actions and its adoption of emblematic images and costumes in liturgy is something that is opposed to the evocation and expression of truly meaningful emotional experiences. These ceremonial properties belong to an organized public way of worship, embodying the corporate action of the church tradition. But for the Puritans, the

---

<sup>5</sup>Dix, p. 632.

subjective experience, not the external action, is always the important thing.<sup>6</sup>

In the Puritan scheme of things, ceremonies and rites must answer to the natural and unfeigned religious needs of men. If a ceremony contains artifice, it serves no good purpose. As William Bradshaw, a Puritan critic, put it in "A Treatise of Divine Worship (1604)," "Nature only frameth them [ceremonies] well, so if it shall appear they proceed from her, and are not forced and wrung from men (invita minerva), she putteth into them such a light, that any of ordinary conceit may in the sign see the thing signified."<sup>7</sup> If not, ceremonies are nothing less than human presumption, "For humane Ceremonies, imposed and observed as parts of Gods worship, must needs be Worship proceeding from mans Will, or will-Worship," according to William Ames in his

---

<sup>6</sup>It might be judged too simplistic to consider the controversy in terms of the clear-cut Anglican-Puritan dichotomy. In my defense, I refer to Joan Webber and her The Eloquent "I" (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968). Despite the dangers of making broad generalizations, the work is a persuasive documentation of two different kinds of styles: The Anglican style being "meditative, anti-historical, obscure and ambiguous, symbolic"; the Puritan style being "active, timebound, as simple and visible as possible," averse to fiction (pp. 7, 8, 255-56). My contention regarding the ceremonial controversy is similar to Webber's opinion, although I have arrived at my conclusion from different historical material.

<sup>7</sup>Quoted by John D. Eusden in Puritans, Lawyers, and Politics in Early Seventeenth Century England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), p. 74.

"A Fresh Svit against Human Ceremonies in Gods Worship, (1633)."<sup>8</sup>

It appears reasonable to suppose that what the puritans really objected to in ceremony is that ceremony is a man-made, artificial form of worship. Though conceived as an enduring form that gathers up what is experienced in formless fashion, ceremony, to Puritan thought, is artificial and is necessarily removed from the immediacy of the experience. Because ceremony involves objectification and to a considerable degree, symbolic abstraction of worshipping experiences, there is a distance, according to their sensibility, from the true experiences of religion. Instead of being the ordering instrument by which a man knows his relation to God, to others, and to the world, ceremony seems to be the manifestation of artificiality and falsehood. Besides being the remnant of Popish flummery and pagan superstition, one could question that ceremony at best was illusory. Of all the liturgical ceremonials which stirred up controversy during Charles I's reign, especially during Laud's ecclesiastical administration, three cases can be cited to illustrate the Puritan aversion to the Anglican liturgical impulse to worship emblematically and

---

<sup>8</sup>Quoted by Keith L. Sprunger in The Learned Doctor William Ames (Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1972), p. 89.



symbolically. The first instance is the matter of railing the altar in the east end of the chapel. The reverence for the east end seems to have derived from several traditional thoughts. But essentially the east meant, to the Anglicans, the symbolic place of God's corporeal presence and the object of reverence and adoration, and hence the practice of placing the altar in the east was conceived.

The Puritan scorn of such practice can be heard in Edmund Hickeringill's Ceremony Monger in which he says that:

If I were a Papist . . . who believes that God is enthroned in the east . . . , I profess I would bow and cringe . . . and pay my adoration to that point of the compass /the east/; but if men believe that the Holy One who inhabits eternity is also omnipresent, why do not they make correspondent ceremonies of adoration to every point of the compass?<sup>9</sup>

The second instance is the matter of bowing to the altar or at the entry of churches. Bowing is the expression of an attitude of respect or reverence, thus signifying a devotional instinct. Of the Puritan reaction on this matter, we are informed by one Z. Crofton that:

For which /the communion table/, reason will require some symbol of divine nature and presence; its being an holy instrument of divine service, being of no more force for the altar than for the tongs or snuffers of the tabernacle, . . . or for surplices, organs, chalices, patens, and canonical coates, and girdles, which are made instruments of holy service

---

<sup>9</sup> John Brand, Observations on the Popular Antiquities of Great Britain (New York: AMS Press, 1848), volume II, p. 319. Though the book came out late--1689--Hickeringill is quoted as a summing-up of the Puritan sentiment.

by our altar-adorers; and if on that reason they must be bowed unto, we shall abound in cringing not only in every church, but in every street.<sup>10</sup>

The third instance is the placing before the altar of candlesticks, basins, crosses, crucifixes, and the implementation of incense and images in the church. Grounded in the medieval devotional tradition, these appurtenances have a dual purpose. As a whole, they are beautifying and pious furnishings of the church. Individually, however, each item is utilized to symbolize a certain aspect of devotional consciousness. For instance, the crosses are to focus attention on the fact that the Son of Man died, and here is the living memorial of His passion; the images signify a real part of the joy and worship of the redeemed in heaven, thus indicating what the earthly worship of the church 'manifests' in time; and the incense works as a mark of reverence and an offering to God, as well as a propitiatory censuring and an atonement for sin.<sup>11</sup>

My understanding of the Puritan sensibility to these furnishings can be helped by a terse phrase found in a sermon delivered in the Cathedral Church of Durham in 1628.

---

<sup>10</sup>Brand, volume 2, pp. 321-22.

<sup>11</sup>Dix, pp. 622, 425, 428, 429.

The phrase summarizes Puritan sentiment by saying that such furnishings are "for a dumbe shew."<sup>12</sup>

The Puritan suspicion extended not only to church ceremonies but to many other traditional and seasonal ceremonies. Douce observes in his Illustrations of Shakespeare that:

During the reign of Elizabeth, the Puritans made considerable havoc among the May-games by their preachings and invectives. Poor Maid Marian was assimilated to the whore of Babylon; Friar Tuck was deemed a remnant of Popery; and the Hobby-horse as an impious and Pagan superstition; and they were at length most completely put to the rout, as the bitterest enemies of religion.<sup>13</sup>

Phillip Stubbes, a rigid Elizabethan Puritan, regarded the May day festivity as an essentially heathen institution and the Maypole as a pagan idol "where it is the 'perfect pattern, or rather the thing it self.'"<sup>14</sup>

To bring the matter more up to date, it is recorded that the Lords of Misrule in colleges were preached against

---

<sup>12</sup>Brand, volume 2, p. 320.

<sup>13</sup>Brand, volume 1, p. 503.

<sup>14</sup>Phillip Stubbes, The Anatomie of Abuses (New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1973), volume 1, p. 187(?). Stubbes is important in that he anticipates Prynne's argument against the stage more on his unconsciously revealed aesthetic ground than on the moral one. As Barber notes, Stubbes' objection to the performance of the May-game ceremony, for instance, approaches the affinity Barber finds with dramatic experiences.

at Cambridge by the Puritans in the reign of James I, as "inconsistent with a place of religious education, and as a relic of the Pagan ritual."<sup>15</sup>

Other national ceremonies and pastimes are equally denounced by William Prynne. One of his severe invectives is against the Rite of New Year's Day:

If we now parallel our grand disorderly Christmases with these Roman Saturnals and heathen festivals, or our New Yeare's Day (a chiefe part of Christmas) with their festivity of Janus, which was spent in mummeries, stageplayes, dancing and such like enterludes, wherein fiddlers and others acted lascivious effeminate parts, and went about their towns and cities in women's apparel; whence the whole Catholicke Church (as Alchuvinus with others write) appointed a solemn publicke feaste upon this our New Yeare's Day (which feaste it seems is now forgotten), to bewaile those heathenish enterludes, sports, and lewd idolatrous practices which had been used on it.<sup>16</sup>

Even the exchange of New Year's gifts, which served to renew friendship as one of the greatest gifts of God, is viewed "heathenish and superstitious."<sup>17</sup> A ceremony of toasting or drinking health, a gesture of well-wishing, is under attack by Prynne in his work, "Healthes Sicknesse." For Prynne, the pledging of health "is but a Vaine, a Carnall, Worldly, Heathenish, Profane, Superfluous, Unseemly, Foolish, and

---

<sup>15</sup>Brand, volume 1, p. 503.

<sup>16</sup>Brand, volume 1, pp. 18, 19.

<sup>17</sup>Brand, volume 2, p. 338.

unnecessary Ceremony, Ordinance, Customes, Tradition, Right or Rudiment."<sup>18</sup>

The most obvious ground of the Puritan objection to ceremony is moral. In fact this is the standard understanding of it. Previously, I have speculated that the controversy is underlined by the Puritan mistrust of formalism and the rubric of symbolism, the characteristics which are shared by liturgy, pageants, festivals and play. For my argument, the important fact is that the Puritan objection did not distinguish the nature of ceremony of one kind from another: in their enthusiastic moral indignation, the Puritan objection extended from liturgy to drama; thereby revealing, curiously, the Puritan recognition of ceremony as an unifying factor of those human imaginative activities.

Returning now once more to Prynne, my tentative speculation about the objections to ceremony by the Puritans can be attested to by his famous denunciation of the stage. Besides the fact that the Histrion-Mastix published in 1632 summarizes all these anti-ceremonial sentiments, the book is also a most telling illustration of my speculation. It is true that the force of Prynne's reasons for adjudging all aspects of the theatre evil and sinful springs mainly from moral considerations. According to the title page, his

---

<sup>18</sup>Brand, volume 2, pp. 238. 518.

purpose is to prove, once and for all, "that popular stage-plays (the very Pompes of the Divell which we renounce in Baptisme, if we beleewe the Fathers) are sinfull, heathenish, lewde, ungodly Spectacles, and most pernicious Corruptions; condemned in all ages, as intolerable Mischiefes to Churches, to Republickes, to the manners, minds, and soules of men. And that the Profession of Play-poets, of Stage-players, are unlawfull, infamous and misbeseeming Christians."<sup>19</sup> Dedicated to Lincoln's Inn, the book warns youthful lawyers to shun the sinful atmosphere of the theatre, for too many learn as soon as they are admitted to the Inns of Court "to see stageplayes and take smoke at a playhouse." According to his estimation, forty thousand playbooks were printed within two years, and the six playhouses, "the Divells Chapells," were overcrowded. ("The Epistle Dedicatory")

Despite its length (1006 pages), Prynne is never at an impasse to heap up depictions of the sinfulness of playhouses, actors, and patrons. All manner of pleasure is included in his invectives: men never "went as yet by multitudes much less by morrice-dancing troopes to heaven" (p. 244); those who love rounds and dances would have a portion with Herodias in hell (p. 253); organ-playing in the

---

<sup>19</sup>First edition, title page. The quotes used are from this edition.

churches, the mistletoe and holly of Yuletide, and the bonfires of Midsummer's Eve are all denounced. ("To the Christian Reader")

As for the common people, Prynne points out that going to a playhouse is immoral as well as expensive. Not only do men become "inamor'd with love of sinne and vanity," but women are attracted by this 'apish pastime." If Prynne does not single out Henrietta Maria as a vanguard of "our lascivious rattle-pated gadding females," he does not exclude her in his caustic censure of women who participate in masques: "And dare then any Christian women be so more than whorishly impudent, as to act, to speake publickely on a Stage, (perchance in mans apparell, and cut haire, here proved sinfull and abominable) in the presence of sundry men and women?" (pp. 214-15)

To Prynne, every disaster is a sign of God's judgment on man's immorality. He points out the recent burning of the Globe and Fortune theaters as the result of the patrons' failure to heed the warning. (p. 556) He objects to obscene incidents which are portrayed in the theatre, not as warnings but as the delight the play-writers have in such incidents. (p. 95) Though he attended only four plays, his knowledge of relevant writings on the theatre appears to be extensive. One authority after another is called in in support of his moral argument.

Throughout his moral crusading, however, there is yet another insistent thread of assumption. Though it is less often noticed, yet it substantiates my argument. Prynne's moral objections are supported by the assumption that what is considered ceremonial has an affinity to whatever is connected with "stage-plays." In "To the Christian Reader," he explains his stance in the following manner:

If you consider them, as they are here applied, you shall finde them all materially pertinent to the theame in question; they being either the concomitants of Stage-plays, or having such neare affinity with them, that the unlawfulnessse of the one are necessary mediums to evince the sinfulnessse of the other. Besides, though they differ in Specie, yet they are homogeniall in their genericall nature, one of them serving to illustrate the quality, the condition of the other: It is no impertinencie therefore for me to discourse at large of all or any of these, the better to display the odiousnesse of Stage-plays, with which they have great analogie, to which they have more or less relation, as the passages themselves sufficiently manifest. (p. 2)

What Prynne finds "concomitants of," "affinity with," "homogeniall in," and "analogie to" is "Dancing, Dicing, Stage-plays, lascivious Pictures, wanton Fashions, Face-painting, Health-drinking, Long haire, Love-lockes, . . . Bonfires, New-yeares-gifts, May-games, amorous Pastoralls, lascivious effeminate Musicke, excessive laughter, luxurious disorderly Christmas-keeping, Mummeries." (pp. 2-3) Some of them are definitely traditional ceremonial forms: health-drinking, bon-fires, New Year's gifts, May-games, Christmas-keeping belong to seasonal ceremonies, and mummeries are



ceremonial play and dancing. Further on in the book, these activities are condemned as part of "the Festiuities, Customs, Ceremonies, Reliques, or Inuentions of Idolatrous Pagans." (p. 20)

For my argument, two points are important, though perhaps not in the way Prynne intended to reveal. One point is that these objectionable activities are underscored by the concept of ceremony. Particularly, "ceremonies, and circumstances . . . attend our Stage-playes," such as "Festiually, and Birthdayes." (pp. 43, 47) More importantly, "the Stile, and Subiect Matter of most popular Stage-playes, is Heathenish, and Prophane, consisting of (d) Actes, the Rites, the Ceremonies, Names, and Persons." (p. 75) The other point is that these activities are "inuentions," and worse, they are "vnnecessary Inuentions." (p. 36) The second point is further described as "a degenerous, and Vnchristian symbolization with this present World" (p. 48) and "Fabulous, and Fictitious." (p. 62)

The logical consequence of this kind of interpretation of ceremony is that far from restricting Prynne's objection to questions of morality, it enlarges ceremony into the aesthetic domain. What he unwittingly shows to us seems to be the process of ceremony becoming dramatic art ("the Hearing, and Reading of such Histories, and Fables as these [the subject matter of what he considers ceremonials],

which are oft times sugred, and guilded ouer with the very quintessence of Art and Rhetoricke." (p. 79) It would be suggestive of Prynne's thinking that he cites the Mass as "a Tragicke Play." (p. 113) Though used as a negative example of the use of the Scripture, the Mass (the liturgical ceremony) is clearly connected with drama, or at least Prynne sees a possibility of connection:

Thirdly, as the historicall passages of the Old Testament, so the historie of Christs death, and the celebration of his blessed Sacraments, are oft times prophaned in the theatricall enterludes, especially by Popish Priests and Iesuites in forraigne parts: Who, as they have turned the Sacrament of Christs body and blood into a Masse-play; so they have likewise transformed their Masse it-selfe, together with the whole story of Christs birth, his life, his Passion, and all other parts of their Ecclesiasticall services into Stage-playes. (p. 112)

So our Tragedian (thus hath he stiled the Masse-Priest, how aptly the ensuing words enforme us) represents unto the Christian people by his gestures, the combates of Christ in the Theater of the Church, and inculcates into them the victory of his Redemption. (p. 113)

Loe here a Roman Masse-priest becomes Player, and in stead of preaching, of reading, acts Christs Passion in the Masse. (p. 114)

Loe here the owne Author declaiming against Popish Priests for their frequent acting of Christs Passion, in the very selfe-same manner, As the Pagans of Old did use to act the lives and practises of their Devill-gods. (pp. 113-14)

Prynne's statements crystallize "a close relationship between allegorical interpretation of the liturgy and the history of drama," and "the Mass as an elaborate drama with

definite roles assigned to the participants and a plot."<sup>20</sup> Ceremony is becoming a play, or a play is becoming a staged ceremony.

Prynne's objection to this kind of aesthetic process is naturally based on the Puritan perception of reality: "false representations of true stories." (p. 157) He summarizes his sentiment in the following words:

If we seriously consider the very forme of acting Playes, we must needs acknowledge it to be nought else but grosse hypocrisie. All things are counterfeited, feined, dissembled; nothing really or sincerely acted. Players are always counterfeiting, representing the persons, habits, offices, callings, parts, conditions, speeches, actions, lives; the passions, the affections, . . . yea, the very vices, sinnes, and lusts; . . . and such like crimes of other men, of other sexes, of other creatures; yea, oft-times of the Divell himselfe, and Pagan Divell-gods. They are alwayes acting others, not themselves. (p. 156)

From a pragmatic and utilitarian point of view, Prynne is entirely right, for nothing is more deceptive and removed from fact than play-acting what one is not. It is natural from such a conviction that Prynne should object to men playing female parts or putting on costumes to indicate different parts (pp. 172-206), as the violation "of the Lawes of God, of Nature" (p. 172), and as the "inverting the very course of nature both in the male and female sex."

---

<sup>20</sup>O. B. Hardison, Jr., Christian Rite and Christian Drama (Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 39.

(p. 204) The implication, however, is that Prynne is attacking the very core of the illusionistic stagecraft which drama and ceremony commonly share. If I shift my perspective from a mechanistic level to a more philosophic one, Prynne can be seen as questioning what the theater is all about. Though his argument is, for the most part, absorbed by the moral ground, it seems fairly acceptable to assume that he thought of the theater in terms of the Renaissance "the world as the theatre" metaphor:

Doe not Play-Poets and common Actors . . . rake earth and hell it self; doe not they travell over Sea and Land; over all Histories, poemes, countries, times and ages, . . . that so they may pollute the Theater with all hideous obscenities, with all the detestable matchless iniquities, which hitherto men or Divels have either actually perpetrated or fabulously divulged? (p. 92)

Under the cloak of immorality, then, Prynne's objections to the theatre embody effects and efficacies of man's aesthetic execution of a form in which the symbolic, visual conception and reshaping of reality is essential. If this is the implicit, albeit unofficial, center of Prynne's thinking, he has presented the strong common elements shared by all which he considered ceremonial: the need of form and representation.

Apropos of Prynne's objection to man's tendency to create symbolic forms, the most peculiar aspect of the book is the way it is constructed. After the manner of those

plays he attacks, he arranges it in prologues, arguments, acts, and scenes, with a "chorus" or recapitulation of the arguments against drama at the end of each act. It closes with a final heaping-up of epithets in a "Catastrophe." One wonders whether this is Prynne's sense of the ironic, or he is betraying himself here and thus embodies his need of form and symbolic enactment.

To summarize what I have been considering, the Puritan moral sense of ceremony goes beyond the confines of the religious controversy and affords possibilities which refer to the consideration of the aesthetic nature of ceremony. What emerges is Puritan syllogistic thinking. Ceremony means formalism and symbolism; formalism and symbolism are, in turn, human artifice and fabrication; and therefore, all forms of ceremony are falsehood. In the Puritan argument, all human activities that contain ceremonial aspects are opposites of facts--at least as perceived and defined by the Puritan. As such, the liturgical ceremonies are a fiction which denies the psychological facts of the individual worshipping experience. Seasonal festivals and civic pageants are mere social spectacles that have nothing to do with the laws of morality and the facts of life. Participation in plays and masques is an act of imposture and lying.

In a larger sense, the Puritan objection to ceremony seems to have something to do with the deliberate denial of

"an impulse," "a desire to express an emotional attitude to life," that "awareness of the extra meaning"<sup>21</sup> that allows us to create imaginative activities independent of fact. Conversely, it is in the process of ceremony entering the area of creativity that the merit of the ceremonial controversy lies. Because historically it is closely bound with the religious dispute, the concept of ceremony has been narrowly interpreted. Perhaps we will do well to take a hint from what Stephen Orgel has said about the Puritan rhetoric against the royal theatrical production of the masques which are a form of ceremony: "History has vindicated William Prynne; however extravagant its rhetoric, the Puritan invective against royal theatricals reveals, ironically, an accurate sense of their most powerful effects."<sup>22</sup> Part of my task should be to investigate the "powerful effects" of ceremony freed from the strictly religious context.

---

<sup>21</sup>Enid Welsford, The Court Masque (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), p. 362.

<sup>22</sup>Stephen Orgel, The Illusion of Power (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1975), p. 88.

## 2. The Anglican Defense of Ceremony.

The Puritan objections to ceremony may have been right or wrong in themselves. Motivated as they were by a rigid sense of morality, one finds their objections understandable, and in some respects, one may be sympathetic with their position. But at the same time one also has to recognize that there were good theoretical reasons to argue for the adoption of ceremony in the Anglican liturgy. Viewed from the Puritan side, the concept of ceremonial worship meant the intense concentration and insistence upon external action for its own sake at the sacrifice of what really mattered subjectively and internally. But what is striking about the Anglican defense of ceremony is that it is more carefully and thoughtfully conceived than the Puritans gave it credit for. More importantly here, the Anglican defense provides a general theoretical basis from which I can later develop the idea and form of ceremony and the creative aspects which ceremony and drama seem to share.

Although at first sight the connection between Richard Hooker and the Renaissance theatrical world seems remote, significant scholarship has been done discussing, for example, Shakespeare's humanism and its similarities to Hooker's Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. Despite the quite different professions in which they practiced their talents, Shakespeare and Hooker, some scholars have

demonstrated, share a concern for man's freedom of choice, and with it the human propensity for tragedy, by choosing to violate law and order, both social and cosmic.<sup>23</sup> The fact that there is a connection between them has wide implications, going beyond the confines of Shakespeare's knowledge of and familiarity with Hooker's work. It is Hooker's defense of ceremony that concerns me as the foundation of a theory of ceremony in the manner practiced by the Anglican Church.

In essence, Hooker's argument proceeded from the defense of the hierarchy of his church against the petitions of Puritan clergymen who attacked them as unscriptural. He similarly defended "Rites, customs, and order of ecclesiastical government"<sup>24</sup> (I.i.3) which the Puritans called into question and agitated to alter and to simplify. For these Puritans, the determination of such matters rested with the ministers of God. Hooker ominously prophesied that some

---

<sup>23</sup>H. Haydn, The Counter Renaissance (New York: C. Scribner, 1950); T. Spencer, Shakespeare and the Nature of Man (New York: McMillan, 1949).

<sup>24</sup>The passages from Hooker are taken from the edition by W. S. Hill, The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker, 2 volumes (Cambridge and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977). I refer to the following article as my starting point regarding Hooker and the basic idea of ceremony in the English Renaissance: D. J. Gordon, "Chapman's 'Hero and Leander,'" English Miscellany, 5 (1954): 41-94.



consequences which were likely to follow from the establishment of the Puritan disciplines of worship would be the fragmentation of the Church of England (Preface viii.1), the destruction of the Queen's Supremacy and her prerogative (Preface viii.2), "the overthrow of all learning" and the decay of the universities (Preface viii.3), and even the abolition of the common law and its replacement by Scripture as "the only law whereby to determine all our civil controversies." (Preface viii.2-4) Thus the issue for him was ultimately one of law and the outward form of its power.

To make the link between my ceremonial discussion and the theatre, then, Hooker's treatise provides me with a useful entry into a general theory of ceremony in the English Renaissance. He does this in two areas: first, through his ethical concern with customs and tradition, and secondly, through his concern with the right form to express these ethical concerns. To clarify those concerns, Hooker distinguishes between things of human origin - ceremonies, order, discipline, church polity, and so forth. In his view, things of human origin might vary from place to place and from time to time and yet might serve to rationalize the ideal of a national church working out its own peculiar forms and customs within the encompassing tradition of eternal Christianity. (II.iv.6; III.ii.1-2) Therefore, as a part of the composite of English customs and tradition,

the concept of ceremony is to Hooker an indispensable item required to combat the Puritan emphasis on formless emotionalism. The traditional, and hence formal, nature of ceremony is in Hooker's mind linked with personal, social, and cosmic order.

Within this overall scheme of the Ecclesiastical Polity, ceremony is not to Hooker a thing eternal, a holy thing (III.ii.4), but "some visible solemnities." He defines its "nature," "use," and "qualities" in the following terms:

The end which is aimed at in setting downe the outward forme of all religious actions is the edification of the Church. Now men are edified, when either their understanding is taught somewhat whereof in such actions it behoveth all men to consider, or when their harts are moved with any affection suteable therunto, when their minds are in any sorte stirred up unto that reverence, devotion, attention and due regard, which is those cases semeth requisite. Because therefore unto this purpose not only speech but sundry sensible menes besides have alwaies bene thought necessary, and especially those meanes which being object to the eye, the liveliest and the most apprehensive sense of all other, have in that respect seemed the fittest to make a deepe and strong impression; from hence have risen not onely a number of prayers, readings, questionnings, exhortings, but even of visible signes also, which being used in performances of holy actions, are undoubtedly most effectual to open such matter, as men when they know and remember carefully, must needes be a great deal the better informed to what effect such duties serve. We must not think but that there is some ground of reason even in nature, whereby it commeth to passe that no nature under heaven either doth or ever did suffer publique actions which are of waight whether they be civil and temporall or els spiritual and sacred, to passe without some visible solemnities; the very strangenes whereof and difference from that

which is common, doth cause popular eyes to observe and to marke the same. Wordes both because they are common, and doe not so strongly move the phancie of man, are for the most parte but sleightlye heard; and therefore with singular wisdom it hath bene provided, that the deeds of men which are made in the presence of witnesses, should passe not onely with wordes but also with certaine sensible actions, the memory whereof is farre more easie and durable then the memorie of speech can be. The thinges which so long experience of all ages hath confirmed and made profitable, let not us presume to condemne as follies and toyes, because wee sometimes knowe not the cause and reason of them. A wit disposed to scorne whatsoever it doth not conceave, might aske wherefore Abraham should say to his servant, Put thy hand under my thigh and sweare: was it not sufficient for his servant to shew the Religion of an othe by naming the Lord God of heaven and earth, unlesse that straunge ceremonie were added? . . . The sensible things which Religion hath hallowed, are resemblances framed according to things spiritually understood, whereunto they serve as a hand to lead and a way to direct. (IV.i.3)

Behind this argument lies a montage of contemporary philosophical, ethical, and psychological assumptions. Hooker centers his justification of ceremony in terms of its visual-didactic efficacy: ceremony achieves its didactic effect through visual analogies and the importance of the image and psychological realism. By the process of sighting ("object to the eye," "depe and strong impression"), moving ("harts are moved," "their minds are in any sorte stirred up"), remembering ("remember carefully," "memory whereof is farre more easie and durable"), and finally instructing ("men are edified," "to what effect such duties serve"),

Hooker seems to be philosophizing about ceremony and communication, perception and ethics. A religious or civil ceremony is a visual thing--a visible thing or show. It appeals to the eye and impresses the mind more vividly than words and, hence, is more easily committed to memory. Perhaps Hooker understands that words, no matter how familiar they are ("common"), drift away almost as they are uttered and "sleightlye heard"; but ceremony means a special sign or act ("visible signes," "sensible action"), and therefore this unique visual quality condenses otherwise complicated verbal statements into a form readily grasped at a glance, and hence understanding ensues ("the better informed"). Ceremony consisting of such visible signs and sensible actions is a visual, repeatable enactment of religious or civil significance and thereby can accommodate the process of the human knowledge and understanding to the process of the ethical and intellectual virtues ("edified").

For Hooker the problem seems to have been, finally, to persuade his audience that the outward mode of ceremony ("sensible things") can approximate the inner essence of things ("things spiritually understood"). Ceremony is not merely empty gestures and arbitrary pronouncements as the Puritans perceived it to be. Rather, it is a visual diagram, and hence the imitation and the showing-forth of the informing principle or the final truth which originates, in

Hooker's mind, from God. (IV.i.2) Ceremony, in other words, is the idealized form through which "the essence" and "the substance" of God, though inconceivable to man, can be perceived indirectly in the external "matter and forme" via the agency of man's natural and intellectual vision. Though only an embodiment of the essence ("a certain outward fashion"), ceremony can be a highly visualized pattern or outline which informs one of the ultimate vision of the higher or transcendental world emanating from God. In Hooker's scheme of argument, then, ceremony functions in a kind of emblematic way, as a medium of perception which points to the way of man's ethical reason and duty.

Hooker's pointed defense of ceremony derives finally from his consideration of a larger pattern of philosophical significance. Born of a Renaissance man's perception of reality as a hierarchy in which correspondences and analogies relate the spiritual to the physical world, Hooker's idea of ceremony is concerned with ceremony's primary function of ethical edification. Viewed at a practical and artistic level, however, his idea contains a further concern which has something to do with the right form of expression. This aspect of ceremony is supported by way of the doctrine of decorum. The clue lies in his most casually put phrase, "the same [a certain outward fashion] is in decent sort

administred."<sup>25</sup> In view of Hooker's insistence on ceremony's power of imitating ideal or universal truth, this short phrase allows my view to shift from the theorem to the practical embodiment of a truth. The idea of decency is the root form of decorum, and this is, in turn, the idea of the fitness of the means to the end.

The major Elizabethan statement on decorum is found in George Puttenham's The Arte of English Poesie (1589). Although references to decorum (or decency) are scattered throughout the book, it is in the third book, "Of Ornament," that we find an extended discussion. Because Puttenham is aware of the instability of the term, he details a comprehensive definition of it:<sup>26</sup>

In all things to vse decencie, is it onely that giueth euery thing his good grace & without which nothing in mans speach could seeme good or gracious . . . we wil therefore examine it to the bottome & say: that euery thing which pleaseth the mind or senses, & the mind by the senses as by means instrumentall, doth it for some amiable point or qualitie that is in it, which draweth them to a good liking and contentment with their proper objects . . . The Greekes call this good grace of euery thing in his kinde, *το πρεπον*, The Latines (decorum), we in our vulgar call it by a scholasticall terme (decencie), our owne Saxon English terme is (seemelynesse) . . . and . . . (pleasant approche) so as euery way seeking to expresse this *πρεπον* of the Greekes and

---

<sup>25</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>26</sup> George Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie (The State University Press, 1970), pp. 268-69.

decorum of the Latines, we are faine in our vulgar tounge to borrow the terme which our eye onely for his noble prerogatiue ouer all the rest of the sences doth usurpe, and to apply the same to all good, comely, plesant and honest things, euen to the spirituall obiectes of the mynde, which stand no lesse in the due proportion of reason and discourse than any other materiall thing doth in his sensible bewtie, proportion and comelynesse . . . This lovely conformitie, or proportion or conuenience, betweene the sence and the sensible hath nature her selfe first most carefully observed in all her owne workes, then also by kinde graft it in the appetities of every creature working by intelligence to covet and desire, and in their actions to imitate & perform; and of man chiefly before any other creture as wee in his speeches as in every other part of his behaviour.

Puttenham attempts to define decorum in its broadest sense. While primarily writing on the art of "writing," Puttenham's concept of decorum bears upon the whole hierarchical structure of Renaissance society, its judgments about people and their conduct, and the whole "visible signs of color, dress, insignia and ceremony both public and private."<sup>27</sup> Decorum and decency are understood as one, and decency is the measuring rod for a work of art as well as human behaviors. For a work of art, decorum manifests itself in the rigid prescription of the rules: categories of styles, of genres, and most of all in the invention of characters in terms of men not as they individually are on

---

<sup>27</sup> Madeleine Doran, Endeavors of Art (Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1954), p. 218.

the Aristotelian principle of logic, but as they would appear on the principle of ethics, and in some of the accepted universals of human types, as in Jonson's use of humours.

Correspondingly Puttenham insists on relating literary decorum to religious and philosophical decorum. In human behavior, then, decorum is strongly bound by ethical consideration of the perennial virtues, vices, and passions embodied in action. Like Hooker, he emphasizes the correspondence between the concept and its visible embodiment, for the concept must have its outward expression ("This lovely conformitie, or proportion, or conveniencie between the sence and the sensible"). Puttenham's definition of decorum therefore can be interpreted in another way as the proper harmony between the inner and the outer man, between his reality and appearance. He defines decorum repeatedly in the way he relates the inner to the outer, in the way the outer portrays the inner, and the way the inner flows out to the outer. Hence it is an idea of the highest organic unity, governing a man's whole operation in life, his conduct toward his fellow men in his society, and in his works, whether they are written, spoken, or acted. Like ceremony, decorum has this dual nature acting at once as the tool and ideal for interaction between people by adjusting



proportions, relationships, and colors to achieve a whole ("good grace").

Hooker's allusion to "decency" in ceremonial expression is regrettably short and remains only a hint as to what actual forms a ceremony should take, but by way of his concern with order and in combination with the general Renaissance understanding of decency as explained by Puttenham, I may be able to speculate that by "decent sort administered" Hooker is referring to the right attitude and good form to exhibit before something that represents divine mystery. I may go further and speculate from his phrase that there is a connection between what we do in church ceremony in highly stylized fashion and what we believe to be true. By logical extension, organized forms and shapes are important to our expression of our experiences of ultimate concern. The concept of ceremony, then, is related to this fixing of experiences into orderly and visible shapes.

From the perspective of Anglican liturgical development toward formalism, it is relevant to suppose that ceremony was taken to be not only external things, but also the organizing factor in the liturgical form. This aspect is important. In "the shape of the liturgy,"<sup>28</sup> - the whole

---

<sup>28</sup>This is Dix's phraseology.

sequence of the ceremonial rite for the Eucharist was emphasized as essentially one action - "the service must have a logical development as one whole, a thrust towards that particular action's fulfilment, and not merely a general purpose of edification. It must express clearly by the order and connection of its parts what the action is, which it is about, and where the service as a whole is 'going.'"<sup>29</sup> Formalism in terms of such an idea of the rite is not a series of "bare signs or ceremonies,"<sup>30</sup> but a logical progression of parts coherently fulfilling one complete action. Working within its own logic, formalism has its own organic unity and significance, and a ceremony expresses a united and uniting action, and effects "good grace" and "decency" of the formal whole.

In the setting of the Anglican liturgy, what I have suggested about the interrelationship between ceremony and formalism may be supported by some of the contemporary writers. What Hooker set out to say about the form of ceremony seems to be exemplified by Thomas Morton, George Herbert and William Laud.

---

29

Dix, p. 2.

30

Dix, p. 632.

Throughout A Defence of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England (1618),<sup>31</sup> Thomas Morton sustains his argument for ceremony with "the rules of Order, and Decencie." Though written for the specific defense of the three "nocent" ceremonies (i.e., the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, and kneeling at communion), his defense concerns me primarily because of the first section which he calls "The generall Defence of the three Ceremonies." In it he defines ceremony and explains its function and ethical meaning.

His care for form is discernible in his initial definition of ceremony. To him, ceremonies are things indifferent: "(being not the body, but the garment of Religion), they are left to the libertie of the Church." (p. 3) They belong to "the externall forms of government, and Rites of the Church" and "externall discipline." (p. 6) Though they "are inuented of man," ceremonies are "Divine: but why? Euen because it is a part of that Decencie, the care and obseruation whereof is commended vnto vs, by the Apostle; Let all things be done decently, and in order: But humane, for farre as they are appropriated by men to some circumstance of person, time or place; and so it is in this Scripture rather intimated than expressed." (pp. 25-26)

---

<sup>31</sup>I use the text made by University Microfilms, No. 18179.

Like Hooker, Morton does not deem that ceremonies belong to the essential part, that is, the doctrinal matter, of religion, but rather that they refer to external structure and appurtenance. Hence his metaphor of the garment. Ceremonies work as to "cloath and apparell the naked bodie of man," (p. 18) which stands for the matter of faith and salvation. His contention seems to be that though the doctrine cannot be touched by human hand, ceremonies work as "accessary complements," as "a note of our greater estimation thereof." (pp. 27-28) Though man-made, ceremonies are conceived in such a way as to demonstrate our deepest sense of reverence towards "the word or will of God," (p. 30) and therefore they justifiably carry out and express the meaning attached to that final action.

In Morton's argument, there is an emphasis on ceremony's earthly and human aspect, consistent with his acceptance that in essence ceremony is a human invention. He explains this aspect by way of the dispute over the interpretation of the term "signification." (p. 48) On the Puritan side, the term means superstition and untruth. According to Puritan understanding, signification means "operative" (p. 59) power of ceremonies. That is to say, the performance of ceremonial sprinkling of water on the people, for instance, effects "purging veniall sinne," and "driuing away deuils." (p. 59) This, however, cannot be

possible, and therefore every ceremony conceived on the basis of signification is far from truth. Morton takes the term to have the "figurative" (p. 51) power and to mean "signes symbolically." (p. 51) Thus the idea of signification is related to man's symbolic manner of expression and psychological truth. There is a correspondence between what one perceives to be true about faith and the outward embodiments of truth. Ceremonies are moral signs which show "mans spirituall duty and obedience towards God" (p. 52) "by resembling spiritual things: to wit, the Surplice to betoken Sanctity of life; the Signing the forehead with the Crosse, Constancy in the faith of Christ; and kneeling at the Communion, our Humility in receiuing such pledges of our Redemption by Christ Iesus." (pp. 53, 54)

Perhaps I can recognize Morton's summary view on ceremony when he explains that it is an ethical decorum manifested in Renaissance hierarchical estates of man:

. . . there is no place of refuge or defence, for your Puritan manner of opposition, seeing that the intention of the Law-maker, in ordaining of our Ceremonies, proceeded from the zeale of Conformities; . . . if you would but acknowledge . . . that there is the same obligation of conscience, by the Law of God, concerning your obedience to the lawfull orders of the Church, established by the King & whole Estate; as there can be of your owne wiues, children, or seruants vnto your selues. In all which kind of relations, such omission may proceed from men of awful affections, such as if they knew that their Superiours should vnderstand of their errorrs, and be greatly displeased thereat, would readily recall themselues: whereas the other omission, which is

done by wilfull opposition, must necessarily argue a contemner of the Commander, and inferre a destruction of the Law and Command. (p. 194)

Like Hooker, Morton sees ceremony as a symbol of order and law which distinguish the different estates of men whose union in difference makes the hierarchy of society. Ceremony thus effects an ethical decorum, as it interprets and fixes one's relationship to the society and to one's proper sense of self.

At the same time, ceremony brings about an aesthetic decorum, because it is moved by man's impulse to create orderly form in highly abstract and symbolic ways. Morton explains this aspect in terms of "Appropriation"--the orderly expression of feelings appropriate to a situation--by asking a rhetorical question:

then are you to consider, whether it may be thought agreeable to the law of good Decorum, to see the Pulpit-cloth vsed in the stead of a flag, in a May-game; or the Communion-cup carried abroad, for common vse to serue at an Ale-house; or to behold so much as a Ministers gowne hanging on the backe of a Tinkar, or Car-man. (p. 214)

The kind of Anglican ceremonial sensibility similar to Morton's is traceable in George Herbert's The Country Parson. Although Herbert wrote it primarily as a handbook for those who needed aid in becoming a country parson, my interest in this work derives from the ultimate sense of decorum which he displays in the process of making an ideal Anglican parson. As with his fellow Anglicans, Herbert's

operative words are decency and order, and his emphasis on outward examples as one's emotional truths. What is relevant to me is Herbert's final vision of ethical and aesthetic integrity, his courtesy and decorum of inward and outward harmony which the ceremonial forms in general exemplify.

It is clear from the outset that Herbert's method is to set forth a good example, "to set down a Mark to aim at."<sup>32</sup> His method is to develop personal virtues and then, to extend them outward to the public sphere, and thereby to create a timeless image of a good Anglican. He presents good examples, hoping to effect similar good in others. A sense of decorum, decency and order governs Herbert's parson inwardly and outwardly. Some chapters illuminate his sensibility.

In Chapter VI, "The Parson Praying," Herbert is concerned with the external forms of developing and maintaining the dignity of the parson, as well as of his parishioners. His "mark" is proper harmony between external behavior and inner feeling. When the parson prays, he "composeth himselfe to all possible reverence; lifting up his heart and hands, and eyes, using all other gestures which may express a beauty and unfeyned devotion." His example in turn must

---

<sup>32</sup>The quotes are taken from The Works of George Herbert, edited by F. E. Hutchinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), p. 224.

extend to the whole congregation, for "no Sermon moves them so much to a reverence . . . as a devout behavior in the very act of praying." (p. 231) The goal is to avoid improper behavior ("by no means enduring either talking, sleeping or gazing, or leaning, or halfe-kneeling, or any undutiful hebehavior") and to attain "a strait, and steady posture." Attention is fairly given to the parson's behavioral harmony, so that the parishioners also will reflect and extend the parson's example.

In Chapter VIII, "The Parson's Church," there is also a passage specifically showing Herbert's point of view towards certain matters of liturgy: "Let all things be done decently and in order" and "let all things be done to edification." (p. 246) The church is maintained in good order by the parson's "speciall care" of its building and its ceremonial furnishings. In this sense, the church becomes an extension of his character. His internal decorum, order and decency find external signs in the parson's church. The external things and forms thus become an embodiment of the parson's inner sense of self.

Chapter XXIII, "The Parson's Completeness," is an expression of the harmony between the parson's life and the world around him. Along with Chapter XXII, "The Parson's Catechizing," this chapter is concerned with how to teach the Christian doctrine. But what is important to me is the



way Herbert teaches the doctrine, for in this chapter he is presenting his own version of the theory of visual-didactic analogies and symbols. His basic approach is similar to Hooker's idea or Morton's appropriation, in that the three men explain the adjustments of divine knowledge to human understanding by presenting images of the perception of truth. What can be considered Herbert's improvement of Hooker and Morton is that he uses the more familiar objects of the English countryside, and connects them to the doctrine. To achieve this end, Herbert resorts to Scriptural examples of Christ's also using familiar things. (p. 261)

The result of this is the unity of the parson's method and labor and the harmony of the world around him. While the parson practices his vocation via familiar analogies, he is able to accommodate divine knowledge to the human limits of his parishioners. This in turn changes the perception of the parishioners, who returning to their labor, "have every where monument of his Doctrine, remembering in gardens, his mustard-seed, and lillyes; in the field, his seed-cord, and tares." As the parson's labor is transformed by connections, so is theirs.

Herbert is adapting visual analogies to his special circumstances. Physical objects ("monument of his Doctrine") not only symbolize and express ideas that are associated with them by a learning process, but also are aids

for memory. The primary importance of the sense of sight is obvious here. If visual objects are associated with ideas, or doctrine, these objects will serve to embody the ideas for the beholder. In Herbert's case, his practical knowledge of country life and people is united with his divine knowledge, and this unity allows him a special source of illustration for ideas.

Together with his Latin poems written in defense of the Church ceremonies, Herbert's Parson offers the essential virtue of formalism and ceremonialism: the outward mode is the expression of the inward fact. There is, in his way of thinking, an equation between outward orderly decorum and inward orderly thoughts. And this equation spreads in a widening circle: one's personal decorum extends to the world around him, which in turn reflects the unity and harmony between human order and the divine order.

William Laud's defense of ceremony summarizes the Anglican formalistic sensibility. In the dedicatory preface to his A Relation of the Conference (1639), he writes that without "inward worship" there can be no reality, but "external worship" is "the great witness" to it. This is his basic reason for endeavoring to secure "decency and an orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church. For of that which is inward there can be no witness among men. Now no external action in the world can be

uniform without some ceremonies. And these in religion, though ancient they may be, the better so they may fit time and place." The main factor in his outlook is the visible Church with its easily visible continuity, and hence his emphasis on ceremonies which are "the hedge that fence the substance of religion."<sup>33</sup>

Finally, what unites the five men considered here is this end: to erect a ceremonial ideal in which "speech and behavior must be appropriate to the person, the place, the time, the circumstance, the end or purpose."<sup>34</sup> Dedicated as much to the moral cause as the Puritans were, they attempted to create a standard of values, beliefs and emotional attitudes, and they developed its proper, physical style which gave it its self-consciously formal character. As the Puritans rightly pointed out, these Anglicans were to cultivate an artificial following after man's nature, always taking care, however, to reinforce the physical style with ethical integrity, whether it was a matter of faith or of man's more secular concerns. Though mainly concerned with the style of faith, the Anglican ceremonial ideal aimed at an ethical aesthetic involving man's whole being, and

---

<sup>33</sup>Quoted by H. R. McAdoo in The Spirit of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century (London: Adam and Charles Black, c. 1965), p. 339.

<sup>34</sup>Doran, p. 217.

relating itself to man's capacity for self-analysis and self-expression in life and in art.

## II. CEREMONY AND DRAMA

Among the potential advantages the foregoing ceremonial controversy seems to afford, two appear to be of cardinal significance to my application of ceremony to John Ford's drama. The first is ceremony conceived as a framework. In my scheme of things, the term ceremony frames a main action or a theme to reflect ideas, values or beliefs. It involves an individual or a group of individuals either as participants or as spectators. The participants' physical gestures and verbal skills bring a priori such a theme into relief. In other words, ceremony has something to do with one's basic approach to physical actions and language which are appropriate in some important way to an occasion of significance.

For instance, the ceremony of the Eucharist frames man's sacrificial relationship to God. The participants' use of language, gesture, costume and action helps to define the theme, and commemorates the celebration of human life. The actual participation in the ceremony provides a way of promoting ethical sensitivity or a way of providing emotional experiences for all - whether players or spectators. In Ford's contemporary secular ceremonies, such as the royal entries, the progresses or the masques, the explicit social structure of messages are framed. In the entries and progresses, the security, power and strength of the monarchy are

shown and declared. The figure of the monarch is the symbol and emblem of the binding force of the society, and he is the central actor and theme during most of the public ceremonies. These ceremonial forms are a vital way to demonstrate and emphasize where the real power and order exist. The royal masque, whose form was polished and refined into a metaphysical conceit by Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones, also becomes a vital form of ceremony. Because of its power of idealization, the masque is one of the most serious ceremonies by which to communicate royal power and will. The presentation of the masque becomes one of the primary media through which a monarch can exercise his will and present his specific concerns. Participation, either as a player or a spectator, means living and becoming part of the ideal reality created in the masque.<sup>35</sup> As Jonson said, the masques are "the mirrors of man's life, whose ends, for the excellence of their exhibitors (as being the donatives of great

---

<sup>35</sup>Stephen Orgel, The Illusion of Power (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975), pp. 38-39. For a more detailed account of the masque and of its operation, see Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, Inigo Jones (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), volume 1, pp. 1-49.

princes to their people) ought always to carry a mixture of profit with them no less than delight."<sup>36</sup>

In its broad sense, Jonson's comment on the masque can be applied to ceremony: ceremony is an emotionally appealing means of showing and moving some sort of value- or belief-system against which one's actions or speeches are judged. According to the Anglican sensibility, ceremony is a concept which enables one to see and live, emblematically, in an ordered society based on the rigid hierarchy of man's estate. But it is also an imaginative medium, as the Anglican sensibility insisted, through which social, emotional, and ethical situations are presented and their meanings interpreted. Though it is a man-made artifice, ceremony frames the images of the standard which the players or spectators might set as goals and imitate. Ceremony is a heightening and dramatizing principle which mediates between the symbolic and literal sphere. As Hooker's defense shows, ceremony clarifies one's physical and verbal actions as ethically meaningful. By setting off an action as having a special meaning, ceremony has the effect of lifting and visualizing the locus of one's being, belief, or emotion which otherwise is formless.

---

36

Ben Jonson, The Complete Masques, edited by Stephen Orgel (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969), p. 454.

If ceremony frames a theme through physical performances, then it can be adapted to certain situations of drama as well. At a simple level, drama would include the distinctly conventional ceremonial situations, such as marriages, funerals, coronations, depositions, banquets, dances, masques, trials, sacrificial rites, ritual combats, processions, entries, and the Lord of Misrule rituals. A dramatist includes those situations as part of his narrative because their meaningful and analogous content alludes to the larger thematic orientation of a play. At the same time, the theme-framing nature of ceremony is capable of greater or less formality on the stage, as the dramatist desires. In a fully stylized action of a conventional ceremony, we have a situation whose meaningfulness is shared by the players as well as by the spectators. The movement of action is geared to the explicit and manifest meaning mounted in a ceremony, such as harmony and concord of the union in the marriage ceremony. All present at the ceremony are constantly aware of such final meaning. Every physical and verbal performance is instrumental to produce that meaning. In drama, similarly meaningful situations--those connected with characters' family or public life, or emotional experiences--constantly appear. Such human situations involving an individual or a group of individuals operate to free both the participants and the dramatist from the demands of



literal likeness to traditional ceremonial situations, and allow them to recreate dramatic situations closely analogous to the conventional ceremonies. Because in drama events are composed of actions connected consequentially according to the dramatist's theme, any series of theme-identifying incidents, a group of characters, or moments can be interpreted as taking on a ceremonial mode. On the stage, such ceremonial situations work as if they were the principal instruments for the persuasive communication of a theme. They appeal visually, and hence emotionally, to the audience. They arouse reactions similar to those aroused in more traditional ceremonial situations. Through the physically heightened actions, ceremonially dramatized scenes are identified with a general theme to which the audience can react. They provide clues to our perception and interpretation of a theme. They operate as a rhetorical language for persuasion and point to the ethical orientation of the drama.

Besides being a theme-identifying device, ceremony's second advantage is aesthetic. Ceremony shares with drama common characteristics of stagecraft<sup>37</sup> which I may be able

---

37

For accounts relating ceremony to drama, see E. K. Chambers, The Medieval Stage, 2 volumes (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1903); O. B. Hardison, Jr., Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Medieval Ages (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965); A. P. Rossiter, English Drama from

to specify from the ceremonial controversy. From the Puritan objection to ceremony, I am able to cull valuable hints as to what the drama shares with liturgy, folk festivals, and pageants. Since the Puritans admixed them all together in their attack, ceremony can be taken as a unifying idea. What the Puritans did is to allow one to bypass the problems of strict verisimilitude and liberate both players and spectators to a more imaginative use of language, gesture, costume, stage, and action. All the imaginative surface materials, such as verbal stratagems, mimetic action or role-playing, and symbolic stylization of the stage, are scattered throughout liturgy and other extra-liturgical ceremonies of the state and the society in order to tell some sort of a story or convey a theme. The shared materials also include stage props, music, time, and space in order to tell a story or theme more effectively. Admittedly resultant effects differ according to the specific story or theme each

---

Early Times to the Elizabethan (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950); Glynne Wickham, Early English Stages, 1300-1660, 2 volumes (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York: Columbia University Press, 1963); Karl Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church (London: The Clarendon Press, 1933).

ceremonial activity is supposed to tell, but those surface materials exist in all different combinations.

Perhaps the most important element of these materials lies in mimetic action or role-playing. In spite of Prynne's objection, the mimetic action is closest to the idea of impersonation proper to a drama, and it seems to gather all other materials into higher visibility. John M. Manly long ago proposed that the use of impersonation, or the impersonational presentation of a story, is the essential criterion of drama:<sup>38</sup>

There were many things which to us seem capable of becoming drama; the only valid test of development is what actually happened. Antiphones /sic/ might become more antiphonal; sermon, epic, comedy, estriſ, débat, might develop a more lively dialogue; none of them as a matter of fact became drama; none of them varied beyond its class. But these things look very much like the drama, and good men and true have been deceived by them. Perhaps the only way in which we can avoid deception is to begin with the medieval drama when it was unmistakably drama, and carefully go back to the time when it came into existence. . . . The features that seem essential to distinguishing it from other forms of literature, and the only essential features, are: the presentation of a story in action, and the impersonation of the characters concerned in the story. Dialogue, though important and usually present, is not essential. (pp. 581-82, 585)

The basic thrust of Manly's thesis is capable of wider use. Impersonation, that is, role-playing, posturing,

---

<sup>38</sup>M. Manly, "Literary Form and the New Theory of the Origin of Species," Modern Philology, 4 (1906-7): 576-95.

simulation or mimetic action, is common to all human conduct and is a basic quality of the ceremonials as well as drama. In the liturgy, the officiating priest is not playing Christ but, rather, simulates the posture narrated in the text made according to Christ's words. He is acting for Christ as his ordained representative. In festival games (such as the May-game or the scapegoat ritual), pageants, and drama, however, the distinction between impersonation of life and impersonation in fiction narrows. While the living actors assume the roles in a May-game, a masque, or a play, the boundary between playing and becoming the role is blurred for that special occasion. The actors can be seen as the actual embodiment of that something that is being presented because not only do they perform roles but they create a temporal reality which the audience accepts as visible and existent. In the impersonating situation, each individual is involved in his own comprehensive drama. The actor is impersonating a stage character and yet, at the same time, is playing his role as an actor. Further, simultaneously, the spectator identifies with--that is, internally impersonates--characters and situations as they might occur and relate to him, while he keeps his role as a spectator and behaves in a way that is socially acceptable to the rest of the audience. Thus, the role-playing in

several levels becomes a kind of self-regarding ceremonial act appropriate to a situation or an experience.

Ceremonial acting and dramatic impersonation are, then, closely linked. While impersonation is a fiction, it also approximates to a character or a situation as it would be experienced in actual life. Impersonation allows one, either as actor or spectator, to gain emotional and visual identification. It provides a heightened illustration of our interpretation of certain experiences of life.<sup>39</sup> The imaginative side of stagecraft, such as language, gesture, costume and stage arrangement, enhances the meaning of each impersonation.

Conversely, part of the special value of the Anglican sensibility is that it supports such stagecraft as a total expression of man's creativity and ethical impulse. Grounded in the basic ideal of decency wherein outward forms reflect inner truths, the Anglican sensibility regards aspects of ceremonial stagecraft as theatrical codes for the imaginative exploration and physical projection of abstract ideas or human experiences. At its most general level, perhaps

---

<sup>39</sup>This aspect will be treated as the general theatricality of human conduct in Ford's plays. The question of theatricality refers to that complicated problem of how much of the outward behavior reflects the truthful inner state and identity of Ford's characters. Often his characters create their private ceremonial stage where they are the central actors enacting their deeply-felt concerns.

the Anglican advocacy of decency is closely linked with one's sense of order as opposed to that of disorder. Ceremony in terms of the Anglican sensibility is an amalgam of ideas which declares against chaos and helps bring that chaos into orderly control. Through form and formality, ceremony conveys man-made meanings which are socially and ethically definable and explicable. Through visually discernible stylizations, ceremony states that the individual's conduct or emotion, or some particular instance of it can be orderly and explicable for the moment fixed, and can be brought to "a temporary, a limited perfection."<sup>40</sup>

Since ceremony aims at right form, "a temporary perfection," in order to convey an emotion or a theme as if it

---

<sup>40</sup>Johan Huizinga, "Nature and Significance of Play as a Cultural Phenomenon," Homo Ludens (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1955), p. 10. I find this section of the book very suggestive, especially his point that there is a connection between drama and ritual ceremonies in the broad cultural context. In its large sense, the section suggests a hint as to how to deal with Ford's so-called unfunny comic characters, the confused emotional states of his characters, and his different styles. If I take them as Ford's perception of the chaotic general condition and disorderly elements that humanity is subject to, my thrust (that ceremonial forms will eventually pull them together in a temporary perfection) will be rendered more relevant. For instance, Doran's criticism of Ford's dramaturgy in Endeavors of Art (i.e. "The tendency to organize events around several episodic centers, with the connections falling slack between them, curses such otherwise fine plays as those of Chapman, Tourneur, Webster, and Ford" p. 298) can be turned around to suggest that Ford writes that way intentionally to demonstrate his particular interest in dramatic form for its own sake.

were acceptable or true, formal organization is of paramount importance. Right form, however, does not mean the total exclusion of disorderly emotions or destructive ideas. In fact, right form is the product resulting from organizing and putting in order disparate ceremonial elements which stem from the chaotic and problematic side of man. In the Anglican liturgy, the whole movement is toward the solemn joyfulness which asserts the principle of man's celebration of life, but in between this forward thrust, there is the singing of the Kyrie eleison shifting the mood from expectant joy to sorrow over human unworthiness. This sudden intrusion of feelings of unworthiness and guilt causes a temporary stop to the forward thrust, creating tension and conflict. This retrogressive step backwards to disorder in human life is contained, however, within the whole scheme of the liturgical theme of Divine forgiveness and the moral rebirth of man. The problematic interruption of the litany of human sinfulness is there in terms of the liturgical development.

In other extraliturgical ceremonies, such as Jacobean and Caroline masques, the disorderly elements are included in the form of anti-masques, presenting "a world of disorder or vice" which the ideal world, the main masque, "was to overcome and supersede."<sup>41</sup> The anti-masques are an integral

---

<sup>41</sup>Orgel, p. 40.

part of the intended message in the main masque, creating contrast and comparison and are "only to be put to flight by the entry of the noble joyous and joy-bringing masquers,"<sup>42</sup> who represent the ultimate order. In the traditional ceremonial games and festivals, the dominant figures of the Fool or the Lord of Misrule constitute the element of defiance, mockery and the abuse of order and organization. "If left to himself the fool will do a great deal of harm in the real world. He is a menace. But since we cannot do without him we take him up out of reality and plant him in the temporary holiday world of misrule or the permanent imaginary world of comedy, a world where he and his brother knave can do their worst against society and no hurt done."<sup>43</sup> In drama, the disorderly elements are often expressed in the antilogistic tendencies of man. We see them embodied in the sudden, inconsistent outbursts of private passions and emotions which dramatic personae display under the pressures of traumatic experiences. But these antilogistic elements are the signs of a dramatic situation's urgency or of the truth in a persona's nature, and they must be organized by some sort of ceremonial artifice akin to the litany of man's sinfulness

---

42

Enid Welsford, The Court Masque (New York: Russell & Russell, 1962), p. 366.

43

Ibid., p. 383.



in the liturgy. Again, the idea of containment within "a temporary perfection" is working here.

Viewed in this way, the ceremonial form refers to the dual sense of order providing a sense of finish and completion in terms of the theme and of individual actions. When I say that the ceremonial form and order are in an organic relationship, it is because ceremony often treats or contains various forms of disorder, ranging from the confusion of everyday life, the disorder of man's choice or emotions, the inconsistencies in ideas or in social arrangements. The degree and kind of disorder taken up by ceremony may vary, but the ceremonial form is paradoxical in the sense that while it aims toward the ultimate completion in form as well as in content, it is necessarily accompanied and made up by separate problematic elements which the ceremonial theme strives to overcome.

It is in the likeness of this extrinsic nature that the ceremonial form and the dramatic form seem to merge: both share this characteristic of creating order for the moment, through which to celebrate the fixed occasion.

"Into an imperfect world and into the confusion of life, it [the dramatic form] brings a temporary, a limited perfection . . . It may be that this aesthetic factor is identical with the impulse to create orderly form, which animates play in all its aspects . . . It is invested with the noblest

qualities we are capable of perceiving in things: rhythm and harmony."<sup>44</sup> The Puritans were right to point out repeatedly the fictional quality of the ceremonial form, for it is the form of human artifice born of man's perceptions and interpretations of the world. But because of this very nature of fictionality, the ceremonial form demands order and controls the structural integrity.

In terms of drama, then, the meaning of the phrase "orderly form" as deduced from the ceremonial form is likened to the progression and development of the events and the characters' conduct as conceived and realized within the framework of a dramatist's theme. A dramatist has a story to tell, and in working out the story, he multiplies and amplifies it by creating characters and incidents for an effective narrative. In the course of the narrative, he employs such techniques as tension, contrast, and variation. But he invariably strives to bring about solution and resolution in the logic of the story. Often incompatible surface materials--the inconsistencies in verbal style, characterization, incidents, emotion, etc.--exist as separate, yet related entities of disorderly ceremonial elements, and contribute to enhancing and creating the final sense of completion. They support and build up to a larger construction of the ceremonial theme.

---

<sup>44</sup>Huizinga, p. 10.

Perhaps the merit of the Anglican ceremonial order is that it refers to a principle of organization--a framework and its externalized physical forms--required of that which we feel to be true and important. Such an organization, either through theme or through stagecraft, explains somehow the wide diversity of man's otherwise formless emotions or ideas. It becomes a means to tidy up man's conduct, to order and synthesize it. Especially as I venture "into a strange but consistent and self-contained dramatic world"<sup>45</sup> of John Ford, I will do well to recall that the ceremonial theme-framing and stagecraft can explain those stylized situations which often seem to appear in his plays' crucial scenes. Indeed I must not regard Ford's ceremonial stylizations as mechanizing actions which blot out the real meaning of a situation's urgency or the individuality of a character. Nor must I see them as mere ceremonial spectacles "running away with a play for the moment and substituting its own kind of gaudy satisfaction for the deeper

---

<sup>45</sup>Northrop Frye, A Natural Perspective: The Development of Shakespearean Comedy and Romance (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965), p. 19.

satisfactions of drama."<sup>46</sup> Instead, I must treat them as a ballast to "the deeper satisfactions" of Ford's themes and concerns, so that his theatre will emerge as a reflection of his ethical aesthetic made over by the Anglican ceremonial ideal.

---

<sup>46</sup>William Frost, "Shakespeare's Rituals and the Opening of *King Lear*," Shakespeare: Tragedies: A Collection of Critical Essays, edited with an introduction by Clifford Leech (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 195.

### CHAPTER III

#### JOHN FORD AND CEREMONY

The various advantages of applying ceremony to a drama, which I have been considering thus far, will become clear as the use of ceremony in Ford's five major plays - The Lover's Melancholy, The Broken Heart, 'Tis Pity She's a Whore, Love's Sacrifice and Perkin Warbeck - is described. In these plays, not only is the idea of ceremony itself stressed, but also ceremonial occasions and moments are some of the plays' most important dramatic experiences. Some of the most crucial moments in these plays take their forms from various religious and legal ceremonial acts, or from traditional folk rituals and court ceremonials, or from theatrical symbolism. An example is found in The Lover's Melancholy where the intended ceremony of betrothal and marriage between Palador and Eroclea erupts into bitter disharmony, and this incident is the activating device for all the following conflicts in the play. Another example is the pomp and circumstance of the court in The Broken Heart which tells the spectator much about the practice of honor in Sparta. In the court scene, King Amyclas, while maneuvering his country between peace and war, is welcoming the heroic

Ithocles to his state and bestows upon him honors due to a hero. In 'Tis Pity She's a Whore ceremonial occasions are utilized to show Giovanni's apostasy of his own humanity. From his abuse of the marriage ceremony to his final self-glorification, Giovanni's attempt to establish a cult of heart-worship shows the spectator that he has unredeemably violated the ethical codes. The trial scene in Love's Sacrifice works as the ceremonial testing of true love, and informs the spectator that not only is the Duke's idea of public honor insufficient, but also the love between Bianca and Fernando transcends the then accepted idea of love and honor. Finally, Perkin Warbeck's assumption of the ceremonial role as the Lord of Misrule becomes a symbolic vehicle for Ford to consider some of the values of man's conduct that the spectator is supposed to perceive and acknowledge.

A persistent characteristic found in these plays is that Ford's characters express their innermost emotions and beliefs in an essentially public form. More particularly, the self-expression of Ford's characters is generally marked by various ceremonial forms, either singly or in combination. Ford demonstrates this consistent interaction between the private self and its outward public expression by his various choices of ceremonial formalism. As the foregoing historical and aesthetic investigations reveal, ceremonies are stylized and symbolic occasions and performances

embodying moments that should recurrently reinforce one's ethical, social, or emotional values. In a ceremonial situation, the participating individual is also an actor subsumed under a larger public framework, which, in some crucial way, appropriately shows individual needs and public values. In other words, a ceremony is an intensely significant personal act made public and symbolic. In this sense Ford uses a number of traditional ceremonials in his plays: marriage and funerals (like those in The Lover's Melancholy, The Broken Heart and Perkin Warbeck); prayers, invocations (like those in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore and Love's Sacrifice); banquets, dances, masques (like those in The Broken Heart); coronations, depositions, pageants, and processions (like those in Love's Sacrifice and Perkin Warbeck); ceremonial arrivals and departures (like the Duke's welcome of Fernando to the court in Love's Sacrifice); the trial scenes in Love's Sacrifice and Perkin Warbeck; the swearing of oaths as in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore; the public proclamation of banishment as in Love's Sacrifice; and the visit to the tomb in The Broken Heart and Love's Sacrifice.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>I acknowledge my indebtedness to the following for the specific enumeration of ceremonial occasions applicable to Ford: William Frost, "Shakespeare's Rituals and the Opening of King Lear," Shakespeare: Tragedies: A Collection of Critical Essays, edited with an introduction by Clifford Leech (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1965): 190-200.

While these are some of the traditional ceremonial occasions immediately and readily discernible in Ford's plays, at the same time they justify his frequent use of visual and visible spectacles and formalism. A ceremonial occasion stresses a way of doing things. As the Anglican sensibility often called attention to the outward forms and styles as extensions of inner truths, the ceremonial acts derive power and meaning from the exact ways things are done as much as from what exactly is done. The reason we respond to the ceremonial moments in those plays is because we feel in Ford's characters an ability to conduct themselves visibly and formally, according to what they learn and understand about themselves and their surrounding world. For example, in Love's Sacrifice, the Duke's spectacular death has an evocative power far beyond the "conventional" act of suicide. His death becomes a self-consecrating ritual act which is a testament of his hard-won knowledge about true affection. In Perkin Warbeck, the incomparable performance of Perkin's ceremonial misrule helps establish him as a man somehow far greater than his initial political aspirations. At the end, Perkin becomes an embodiment of majesty and love in his vision of life as a pageant. Conversely, in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore, Giovanni's wilful enactment of his self-devised marriage rite is an indication of his moral blindness which acts to compromise the dignity of the marriage



ceremony; thus his final appearance on the stage with Annabella's exposed heart becomes a culminating anti-ceremony which recreates the horrid false pretensions of his heart cult. These ceremonial scenes aid the audience to understand Ford's characters by the way they behave, as much as by what they feel. In Ford's dramaturgy, themes and ideas are important, but the visible and visual forms and styles that embody those themes and ideas matter equally. Instead of being simply sensational actions devoid of meanings, the outward gestures and forms are visible translations of the characters' private emotions and beliefs. This emphasis on the outward form is one of the ways Ford achieves what the Puritans called "fiction," the Anglicans called "decency," and Huizinga called "an orderly form."

Moreover, Ford does not achieve his "orderly form" by automatically recreating recognizable traditional ceremonial situations and by putting his characters in those situations. Instead, he exploits the imaginative ceremonial stagecraft which helps to create these ceremonial situations. Any traditional ceremony has a particular message or theme to communicate concerning a significant human experience. Whether it is about the joy of marriage or about the sorrow over death, the theme is by nature very abstract, and therefore must be communicated by physical, theme-identifying devices - such as gesture, language, impersonation, costume,

or stage properties. Each of these physical devices is necessary to act as a visible and tangible attribute or concomitant of the theme. Either singly or in combination, they contribute and cooperate to make up an imaginative representation of the ceremonial theme. Ford explores and broadens this imaginative side of ceremonial stagecraft as an aid to his invention of his own ceremonial situations. As a result, Ford recasts traditional ceremonials in ways which will strengthen his particular themes. At the same time, his attention is focused in fashioning new ceremonial situations which closely parallel the same kind of imaginative organization of human experiences as interpreted by the traditional ceremonials. Ford, then, reinterprets ceremonies as a series of representational and symbolic scenes and moments which recreate and connect the thematically illuminating experiences of his characters. Ford bases his dramatic realism upon his understanding of symbols and rituals in human behavior. As such, Ford's dramatic style is composed of a unified ceremonial stagecraft which subordinates emotional interest in believable characters to the working out of the conspicuously formalized scenes in order to show his major themes.

Of particular importance to Ford's ceremonial stagecraft is the formal order of figures and images, stage arrangement, and the utilization of language. These devices,

either jointly or separately, participate to organize the physical framework of a ceremonial scene, while also hinting at Ford's ceremonial themes. They help to heighten and to justify Ford's particular construction of ceremonial scenes and moments in each play. A number of controlling figures and images are utilized also to complement and extend a ceremonial theme. The clothing imagery, for instance, operates as a symbolic framework which cuts across the characters' psychology and theatricality.<sup>2</sup> It is imagery used at once for disguise, for showing social values, and for displaying the characters' emotional condition. Rhetias of The Lover's Melancholy and Roseilli of Love's Sacrifice disguise themselves as fools. Their fool's clothing is an emblem of their social displacement and distinguishes the excesses of their melancholy. Clothes are also particularly suggestive of a character's emotional transformation. An example is Meleander, who is restored to sanity and thus to the proper order of society in a state ceremony at the end of The Lover's Melancholy. The change of his clothes, from dishevelled to the proper garments of a courtier, indicates

---

<sup>2</sup>The importance of the clothing imagery in ceremony which the Anglican, Thomas Morton, briefly touched upon can be seen in: Hal H. Smith, "Some Principles of Elizabethan Stage Costume," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 25 (1962): 240-257; Stark Young, "On Wearing Costumes," Theatre: Essays on the Arts of the Theatre, edited by E. J. R. Isaacs (New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1968), pp. 200-207.

both his emotional and moral restoration. The play's ceremonial theme of order and harmony is very visibly enhanced when Meleander puts on proper clothes. The dishevelled clothes of Penthea in The Broken Heart, and Bianca in Love's Sacrifice, are also closely connected with the themes of each play. Penthea acts out her own masque of madness when she appears dishevelled. Her appearance in such a condition underscores her lack of emotional restraint -- of which the play's movement disapproves. On the other hand, Bianca's dishevelled clothes enhance the tableau of true affection's meaning. While her proper clothes symbolize her public identity as wife to the Duke, her dishevelled garments signal her withdrawal from that identity. Her clothes visually illustrate the tableau of true affection which transcends outward forms and public identity. Another recurrent imagery is that of the heart. This image is particularly appropriate to Ford's plays whose interest lies in the characters' experiences in love and marriage. Particularly in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore, the image of the heart is elevated to a ritual status, and the difficulties in the ways of manipulating and seeing into another's heart are often the basis of the characters' creating false ceremonies.

Ford also fully utilizes theatrical convention for creating ceremonial moments. Of special note is his manipulation of the contrast between the upper and lower stages in

order to establish a ceremonial tableau or an emblem of the play's meaning. Sometimes the stage arrangements work as a ritualistic parody of Petrarchanism, as in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore. From her vantage point above the stage, Annabella derisively comments about her suitors who are fighting over her in the street below. Suddenly she sees "some celestial creature," only to be reminded by Putana that the object of her adoration is her brother. The romantic connotations of the staging are inverted so as to stress the theme of incest. Sometimes, the contrast of the stage arrangements makes a tragic tableau of virtue, as in Love's Sacrifice. On the lower stage, Fernando courts Bianca by disregarding her married status, and Fiormonda watches the courtship from above. This antagonistic staging is seen to represent emblematically the emotional as well as physical distance between what Bianca upholds as love and virtue and what Fiormonda understands of Bianca's relationship to Fernando. In some instances, the physical arrangement of stage works as a metaphor for life as a theatre. The most conspicuous example of this kind appears in Perkin Warbeck, in which Perkin appears as ceremonial misrule and the world around him is his spectators. Especially in Perkin's first appearance in the Scottish court, his ceremonial gestures and performances are watched from both the top and bottom stages by the Scottish courtiers. Indeed, in Ford's plays, life is

often presented as a theatrical production, and this is a notion which the Puritan sensibility resisted and on which the Anglican sensibility speculated.

In the plays that take place in a court, the use of courtiers, advisors, soldiers, and ruler adds to the fabric of Ford's state and public ceremonies. Some examples are Palador's entry as a recovered prince in The Lover's Melancholy, Amyclas' entry as a welcoming lord in The Broken Heart, the Duke's appearance as the romantic lover in Love's Sacrifice, and James' ceremonial introduction of Perkin to his court in Perkin Warbeck. All these scenes are provided with ruler's command of the trappings of authority, rank, and decorum. The social hierarchy and ceremonial frameworks are created not only by the physical presence of the subjects around the ruler but also by the subjects' behaviors to the ruler. Examples are kneeling, bowing, the strict observance of ranks, and the paying of compliments. Ceremony of this kind indicates the decorum of social personages and distinguishes, like the clothing imagery, the different estates of men.

Another important aspect of Ford's ceremonial art is language. Ford's characters resort to elaborate rhetoric or certain verbal stratagems to distinguish or distance themselves from others or from the social scheme. Circumlocution, for instance, obscures just as much as it clarifies

the characters' social and ethical status. Seemingly elegant euphemisms used by Pelias, Cuculus, and Thomasta in The Lover's Melancholy are really inversions of truly courtly speech. Their euphemisms mirror their spiritual shallowness. They compare to the masque of tested love which Palador's and Eroclea's courtly language creates. In another instance, circumlocution is a means to assert one's social status. Bianca in Love's Sacrifice consciously employs the royal "we" in order to reject Fernando's advances, to place him in his socially subservient status, and to regain her ceremonial status of duchess. In the same play, Fernando and the Duke speak in legalisms in order to put their love for Bianca on trial. With relentless formality, they test their love as if they were judge and jury. In Perkin Warbeck, the verbal pattern is characterized predominantly by abstract terms. This linguistic feature is entirely in harmony with Ford's purpose of casting Perkin as an allegorical figure in the ceremony of the Lord of Misrule.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>The following works clarify ceremony as a formal collaboration with acting, language, images and emblems, and stage settings: C. L. Barber, Shakespeare's Festive Comedy (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1968); Nicholas Brooke, "The Tragic Spectacle in Titus Andronicus and Romeo and Juliet," Shakespeare: Tragedies: A Collection of Critical Essays, edited by Clifford Leech (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 243-256; B. L. Joseph, Elizabethan Acting (London: Oxford University Press, 1951); George R. Kernodle, "Renaissance Artist in the Service of the People: Political Tableaux and Street Theatres in France, Flanders, and

Finally, Ford's ceremonial design is not merely an adroit reworking of traditional ceremonials nor an invention of ceremonial scenes and moments accentuated by visual images, theatrical conventions, and language. His ceremonial design is devised so as to evoke his cherished values and visions that ring throughout his plays. Ford enunciates honor, love, duty, trust, perseverance, and patience as unchanging and solid values which man can constantly uphold. Naturally, such values are presented in constant conflict with the opposing values and forces. In fact, Ford's ceremonial design, with its potential for artificiality and theatricality, partakes of the larger uncertainty and fragility of the world and the human nature. From the unpredictable conduct of his characters to the uncertainty of the social condition itself, little in Ford's

---

England," The Art Bulletin, 25 (1943): 59-64; W. J. Ong, "From Allegory to Diagram in the Renaissance Mind: A Study in the Significance of the Allegorical Tableau," The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 17 (1959): 423-440; Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, Inigo Jones (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Brents Stirling, Unity in Shakespearean Tragedy (New York: Gordian Press, 1966); Roy Strong, The English Icon (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969); Glynne Wickham, Early English Stages 1300-1600 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959).



plays is certain or predictable. Ford sets up the paradigm for the human condition according to his reading of Robert Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy. Ford imitates Burton's philosophical view of the world by presenting a dramatic world where nothing is fixed and permanent. For instance, at the heart of The Lover's Melancholy lies a human dilemma: how do the characters combat the uncertainty of destiny and human passions that threatens stability based on the proper observance of the ceremony of love - namely, the marriage ceremony. As another example, in Perkin Warbeck, Ford attempts to overcome the unstable condition by presenting a protagonist whose upholding of patience and perseverance is the only way left to cope with the anarchic and potentially destructive forces of emotions and body politic that are hidden beneath the frail veneer of civilization. Perkin's assumption of the ceremonial role of the Lord of Misrule becomes the affirmation of his true self. His role-playing also is a culminating metaphor for a possible avenue of escape from the melancholic human state.

Furthermore, the unpredictable nature of human passions and inclinations, the unexpected and terrible consequences of the ethical choices, and the forces of evil contribute additionally to Ford's melancholy sense of uncertainty and disorderliness of the world. These elements

constantly threaten the stability and permanence that Ford's ceremonial values attempt to embody and assure. His characters are invariably under pressure from their violent emotions and inclinations. Each of Ford's plays is bound up with extreme rending of the social and familial fabric: the murder of Palador's love for Eroclea by his father in The Lover's Melancholy; the catastrophic falling out between a brother and a sister in The Broken Heart; the incestuous love between a brother and a sister in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore; an extramarital courtship in Love's Sacrifice; and the political ambitions of a social upstart in Perkin Warbeck. Indeed, the destructiveness of the characters' desires and emotions does always seem out of proportion to the events that bring them about. However, Ford's extremism is not merely intended for sensationalism. Instead, Ford shows how Palador's loss of Eroclea's love leads to general chaos in the Cypriot society, and he hints at the need for proper observance and performance of the marriage ceremony in order to restore Palador's equilibrium. Giovanni's violation of the natural human bond is at once a violation of the marriage ceremony and a symbol for human wilfulness that expands itself into every fabric of his society. In the world of Ford's plays, human passions and inclinations are not presented simply as good or bad. Rather, they are

presented as potent, dangerous and capable of creating a disorderly, destabilized condition, just as Giovanni makes Parma a place of damnation.

Against such emotional forces, Ford's ceremonies are a part of his characters' self-assurance and their self-preservation. Ford's ceremonies help to provide his characters with the moments to intimate their life-sustaining experiences. They also help to define and fix the personal and public identity in the world in which his characters live. They allow Ford's characters to get in touch with the very substantiality of their world and beings. In other words, ceremonies do what the Anglican sensibility aimed at, concerning ceremony: to provide an imaginative, emotionally satisfying artifice, which, at its best, represents a vision that man may have of the spiritual and ethical nature of himself and his world. In Ford's dramaturgy, ceremonial scenes project his characters' ability to make self-regarding rites out of what they consider their true feelings, unalterable beliefs, or best self-images. Ford reinterprets and refines the Anglican ceremonial ideal -- the compatibility of the outward style and the inward truth -- so as to vivify his characters' feeling, belief, or self-image, as well as his own themes, in their proper visible forms.

Ceremonies in Ford, then, may appear as spectacular ceremonial projections of the characters' strongest or true selves, as is always the case of the endings of his tragedies. In some instances, they may appear as intensely heightened scenes where stage arrangements work as frames for theme-revealing tableaux or as emblems in a morality play tradition. Sometimes, the idea of ceremony itself is transformed into an idea of life as a theatre or a pageant. The most conspicuous application of this transformation is found in Love's Sacrifice and in Perkin Warbeck. Ford's almost unfailing incorporation of masques and anti-masques in his plays also signals his bravura reinterpretation of the play-within-the-play idea, and supports his implicit understanding of theatricality and role-playing inherent in a ceremonial situation and in a ceremonial participant.

Close examination of Ford's plays provides proof that his ceremonial designs enhance a play's total organization and meaning. Ford joins gestures, images and languages to the power of a ceremony in order to evoke ideal values and moral attitudes that reach beyond the given moment. In fact, to find the separate ceremonial episodes and moments in a play and to understand their meanings is not sufficient. Ford's ceremonial designs do more. The connection of the individual and the local ceremonial scenes to the total format of a play can readily be seen in Ford's persistent

interest in love and marriage and in the way love and marriage affect his lovers' conduct and ethical choices. It is true that betrothal and marriage are part of those occasions that are traditionally accepted as ceremonial. But in Ford's hands, the betrothal and marriage ceremony substantiates the importance of the ceremonial observance and performance I have dealt with in my examination of the Anglican sensibility. More importantly, this ceremony provides Ford with romantic plots whose center is the emotional life of the lovers. It fixes love and marriage, in the minds of the audience, as points of reference through which Ford can filter and describe the activating emotional circumstances and the turning points of the love story. It helps Ford define the lovers' problems and their attempted solutions of these problems.

Some of Ford's predecessors used the betrothal and marriage ceremony as a plot-generating, theme-framing event in their dramatic expressions. In Shakespeare's The Tempest, for instance, Prospero insists that the betrothal and marriage of Miranda be completed by the proper ceremonies and warns Ferdinand of the dire consequences attending the neglect of the ceremony (Act IV.i.18-26). In George Chapman's Hero and Leander, the goddess of Ceremonie appears to Leander and reproves him for disregarding the "nuptial honors" necessary to his union with Hero ("The Third

sestiad"). In Ben Jonson's Hymenaei, Juno, the patroness of marriage, is celebrated as presiding over the altar "the place, and all the succeeding ceremonies" (the inscription of the altar). In the hands of the above dramatists, marriage is a manifestation and culmination of the union of lovers. It is one of the binding social contracts, and like the decorums of manners and language, it is an integral part of the artifice which maintains and preserves social order and law. Hence performance and observance of the ceremony are not only acknowledgment of the harmonious love between lovers, but also of their participation in the established customs. At the same time, the betrothal and marriage ceremony represents a divine institution. The perfect concord of the lovers becomes a human manifestation of Divine Love. As such, the marriage ceremony corresponds to the unchangeable divine plan for man and the universe. By enacting the ceremony, lovers are divinely and sacredly united and become one with the universal harmony and law. In Shakespeare, Chapman and Jonson, then, refusal and violation of the betrothal and marriage ceremony are treated as an instance of the disturbance of social order, as well as a metaphor for the disturbance of the sacred harmony of the universe. Conversely, performance and observance of the ceremony are an acknowledgment of the divine principle of order and an enactment of the workings of it. Union in betrothal and

marriage is seen as a real and social event, but it is also seen as an event which invokes a dramatist's philosophical and symbolic theme, such as universal law and harmony.<sup>4</sup>

Ford grafts this dual aspect of the betrothal and marriage ceremony into a love story in each of his plays. For example, in The Lover's Melancholy, Ford invests the ceremony with both social and mythic meanings. The violation of the betrothal ceremony by Palador's father is introduced as the direct cause for Palador's posture as a melancholy lover. Later, at the appropriate time, the ceremonial violation serves as a concrete means of expressing Ford's expository theme of harmony and disharmony as they exist in human affairs. Using Palador's melancholy as a metaphor for the general disorderly condition of humanity, Ford stages an anti-masque as a formal cure for melancholy. Finally, Ford not only uses a counter-ceremony of marriage for the restoration of harmony among his lovers; he also emphasizes the general restoration of harmony in society and the universe through the proper observance of the marriage ceremony. In other plays, Ford emphasizes the social consequences

---

<sup>4</sup>Symbolic aspects of the betrothal and marriage ceremony are treated by D. J. Gordon in "Chapman's Hero and Leander," English Miscellany, 5 (1954): 41-92. For the social aspects of the ceremony, see: Carrol Camden, The Elizabethan Woman (New York: Paul P. Appel, 1975); D. P. Harding, "Elizabethan Betrothals and 'Measure for Measure,'" JEGP, 49 (1950): 130-158; C. J. Sisson, Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age (Cambridge: The University Press, 1936), pp. 12-79, 87, 143.

stemming from the violation of the marriage ceremony. In The Broken Heart, the enforced marriage of Penthea and Bassanes is an anti-ceremony which Ithocles imposes by ignoring the true love between Penthea and Orgilus. Orgilus, in turn, pursues revenge which culminates in the annihilation of the social order of Sparta. At the same time, Ithocles' ceremonial violation suggests the need for the proper performance of the ceremony as the manifestation of true love. Calantha's marriage ceremony which joins her to the dead Ithocles is then staged as a formal expression of this need. The lovers in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore mistakenly perform their own self-devised betrothal and marriage ceremony as proof of their genuine love. Their ceremonial violation is a total disregard of the dignity of the true marriage ceremony. Instead, their violation represents an expression of their wilfulness which destroys the social scheme of things. From incest to revenge, every social contract is violated, with every evil stemming from the lovers' thoughtless, ill-use of the ceremony. In Love's Sacrifice, the romanticism of the marriage ceremony is contrasted with the true love which is born outside the marital context. The Duke mistakenly views the ceremony as a customary form that unites him to Bianca's love. But Bianca discovers her true love in Fernando. The tripartite conflict among the Duke, Bianca, and Fernando is examined in a way wherein they recognize



true love without compromising the dignity of the ceremony. Finally, Ford treats the marriage ceremony in Perkin Warbeck from both the social and the mythic perspective. The marriage of Perkin and Katherine defines them as part of the social fabric. At the same time, the ceremony affirms and celebrates their love as an exemplary metaphor for the emotional and self-referential concord. As Katherine asserts at the end of the play, the ceremony is not only a self-defining tool, but also a self-confirming symbolic "act" of love. Thus, the betrothal and marriage ceremony has a dual function: it illuminates the particular conflicts in the light of the universal human experiences of love and marriage, and it also joins the broad cultural experiences of love with the experiences of the lovers' handling of the ceremony within a play. This ceremonial design is a means of enhancing characterization. It shows individual lovers in dynamic tension with their society. It also explains their actions or their state of mind, and it even shows the process of conflict and of choice.

But this ceremony of love is also utilized to introduce something more than a realistic description of the lovers' relationships. Gradually, a new sense of ceremony emerges in collaboration with the traditional rite of betrothal and marriage which motivates Ford's plays. Ford creates an additional ceremonial thread which is more

personal, more poignant, yet more in harmony with the themes and values which he himself is deeply concerned with. This second ceremonial thread is Ford's detailed narrative structure which communicates to the audience each play's ultimate shaping action and idea. While Ford's lovers engage in the self-conscious completion of a recognizable rite of betrothal and marriage, their individual selves and conduct become vehicles for underscoring Ford's additional ethical imperatives. The plot of each play, as it mirrors the lovers' view of love and marriage, becomes part of the play's larger values, and its structured movement provides the basis for clarifications of these values. Ford exploits the traditional rite of marriage and betrothal to give extra dimensions to his plots. Ford creates and recreates his own scenes and moments of ceremony so as to animate his deeply felt values. The plot thus is used to help to create a new ceremonial thread which consists of narrative descriptions of seemingly extraneous characters, incidents, or moments in each play. Those narrative details form contrasting, paralleling, complementing and restating ceremonial scenes of the values which each plot reveals. The second thread therefore places the plot in perspective at the various stages of its development. In addition, the second ceremonial thread alternates and interacts with the plot, while helping to define the play's unity and completion.

In The Lover's Melancholy, the violation observance of the betrothal and marriage ceremony are closely related to Ford's concerns with harmony and disharmony which appear in human affairs. The additional ceremonial scenes and characters--such as the anti-masque of melancholy, the masque of union, the public ceremony, Rhetias and Corax--are devised to enhance Ford's thematic concerns. In The Broken Heart, the lovers' handling of the marriage ceremony is a basis for a far more important ceremonial thread in which the need for decorous, honorable conduct is stressed. Ithocles' breach of the betrothal between Penthea and Orgilus, Orgilus' dark preoccupation with vengeance, the passionate attraction between Calantha and Ithocles, the harmonious courtship and marriage of Euphranea and Prophilus --all these details of love throw a light on the Spartan society whose order and harmony must be maintained by the use of the additional ceremonies of restraint and moderation. The marriage ceremony in 'Tis Pity She's a Whore ironically illuminates the pervasive self-delusion and wilfulness which characterize its characters. Just as the marriage ceremony tends to function as a moral vehicle that conceals the lovers' actions for their own ends, the second ceremonial thread reveals those wrong moral choices and unacceptable social behavior. Using incest as the worst example of willful love, Ford creates the second ceremonial thread which

defines and discloses the complementary examples of erroneous love as manifested in the other characters. In Love's Sacrifice, the traditional marriage ceremony is treated so as to clarify the ideal human love which may be affirmed beyond the confines of the marriage bond. While Ford does not deny the sufficiency of the marriage rite itself, he is concerned with the more personally satisfying love between Fernando and Bianca and with the visible ceremonial embodiments of their love. Personally defined love seeks to find personally satisfying ceremonies of love. Thus the second ceremonial thread is created not only to show genuine love but also to confirm the love in performance. The ceremony of sacrifice, for instance, reinforces and validates the genuine love among Fernando, Bianca and the Duke. Finally, in Perkin Warbeck, Perkin ceremonializes himself as the Lord of Misrule. And that self-ceremonialization, that sense of something larger, dignifies Perkin. In his capacity as the spirit of satire, Perkin is able to raise himself as an image of self-rule, even when he betrays his emotional excess, even when the world around him condemns him. Ford uses the marriage rite in this play as the ballast to this second ceremonial design of self-rule under which the rest of the play's characters are contrasted and examined.

Ceremonies in Ford's plays are great dramatic moments which bridge the symbolic and the real in a play. They

reveal the conflicts of value and feeling created by the characters. They also add an extra dimension of symbolic significance and dignity to the human dilemma. Since Ford's ceremonies seem somehow intrinsic to the civilized experiences of his characters, they bring the audience closer to the crux of the tensions and conflicts within his plays. When the audience wonder, for instance, what is the root of Palador's melancholy temperament, or why they are repelled by Orgilus or Giovanni, or why do Fernando and Bianca change so abruptly, or what the puzzle of Perkin is all about, Ford's double thread of ceremony will help clarify the apparently irreconcilable problems and choices of his characters.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE LOVER'S MELANCHOLY

In speaking of the influence of the masque on the drama, Enid Welsford has written that "Later still, at the beginning of the Caroline period, dramatists such as Ford and Shirley, who were particularly influenced by the masque, show a distinct tendency to revert to the older methods of religious drama, and to compose plays which are not only spectacular but abstract and allegorical."<sup>1</sup> In the perspective of Ford's dramatic career, Welsford's comment points out two important, mutually dependent facts in Ford's artistry. One is Ford's constant attention to the visual and ceremonial execution of form and content, and the other is his perennial concern with a theme centering in ideas and feelings.

Though it is the first of Ford's serious dramatic efforts, The Lover's Melancholy embodies these facts. It is true that because of the play's close connection with Robert Burton's The Anatomy of Melancholy, it has long been quoted as a mechanical, albeit dramatic, exercise of Burtonian psychology. Recently, however, there has been a trend to reconsider the play's meaning in relation to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Welsford, p. 285.

entire Ford canon.<sup>2</sup> Like the genuine masque of The Sun's Darling, there is visible in the play a variety of Fordian formalism. An examination of the action will support the idea that formalism is there for a purpose. Moreover, I shall be able to conclude that the play marks Ford's early mastery of the ceremonial medium and that this also illustrates his early commitment to the prevailing themes of his major plays. From the beginning, Ford's central concern seems to be the exploration of man's passionate nature as the principal material for his ethical meditation. He emphasizes the experience of love and marriage as a way of knowing, and stipulates man's ceremonial conducts as the orderly form, not only of expression but also of knowledge. Ford has always something to say about man's orderly way of life being the highest mark of virtue.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps in many

---

<sup>2</sup>Donald K. Anderson, Jr., John Ford (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972); Michael Neill, "The Moral Artifice of 'The Lover's Melancholy,'" English Literary Renaissance, 8 (1978): 85-106; Mark Stavig, John Ford and the Traditional Moral Order (Madison, Milwaukee, and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968).

<sup>3</sup>That Ford's preoccupation with order and concord goes beyond the domain of his works and touches upon his own life is discernible in his dedication: "A plurality hath reference to a multitude, so I care not to please many; but where there is a parity of condition, there the freedom of construction makes the best music. The concord hath equally held between you the patrons and me the presenter." The fusion of musical analogy of his work with the concord existing between him and his friends may be interpreted as a revelation of Ford's private philosophy.

ways, The Lover's Melancholy may be thought experimental, primarily because of "this piece being the first that ever courted reader"<sup>4</sup> as Ford himself qualifies in the dedication. However, Ford obviously lays down his basic view of man and the world in this play. He also sets up thematic and technical frameworks which I shall develop into two distinct ceremonial threads in the subsequent analysis.

1. The Motive of Action: The Proper Treatment of Ceremony and the Nature of Melancholy.

In the first scene of Act II, Rhetias, in flashback manner, reminds Palador of the momentous event that took place in the past:

Rhetias. I will remember you of an old tale that something concerns you. Meleander, the great but unfortunate statesman, was by your father treated with for a match between you and his eldest daughter, the Lady Eroclea: you were both near of an age. I presume you remember a contract, and cannot forget her.

Palador. She was a lovely beauty. Prithee, forward!

Rhetias. To court was Eroclea brought; was courted by your father, not for Prince Palador, as it followed, but to be made a prey to some less noble design. With your favour, I have forgot the rest.

Palador. Good, call it back again into thy memory; Else, losing the remainder, I am lost too.

---

<sup>4</sup>The lines quoted in this analysis are from the edition of Havelock Ellis, John Ford, Three Plays (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957). For the line divisions, I have used W. Bang's edition, John Fordes Dramatische Werke (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint, Ltd., 1963).



Rhetias. You charm me. In brief, a rape by some bad agents was attempted; by the Lord Meleander her father rescued, she conveyed away; Meleander accused of treason, his land seized, he himself distracted and confined to the castle where he yet lives.  
(II.i. 740-57)

The passage is important because it refers to the proper treatment of ceremony on which the motive of the play's action rests.<sup>5</sup> Rhetias tells Palador that a crime was committed against the form of ceremony that bound Palador and Eroclea to their marriage contract. The seriousness with which such a contract is viewed stems from the general Renaissance definition of marriage that it is a joining by God of a man and a woman into one body, mind, and will. Therefore, the great dignity and significance of marriage is treated as a metaphor of the divine union, and because of this theological-philosophic basis, in human affairs it is seen as an embodiment of sacred order and harmony. The contract between Palador, who will be the future ruler of Cyprus, and Eroclea, who is the daughter of a leading statesman, is as binding as a ceremony. It thus has a civil and ethical basis.<sup>6</sup> Their contract distinguishes the

---

<sup>5</sup>Refer to footnote no. 4 of Chapter III for some of the dramatic expression of the importance of ceremonial observance I have dealt with in the Anglican sensibility.

<sup>6</sup>It is true that Ford does not describe how binding the betrothal of Palador and Eroclea is in seventeenth-century terms. In my defense, I first refer to the mystical setting similar to those wherein contemporary treatments of

different estates of men whose union in difference determines the stratification of society, and this, in turn, reflects the ultimate order and harmony of the universe. The contract is not only blessed by the respective parents, or figures empowered with familial authority and order, but is also sanctioned by the divine source of cosmic order and harmony. That Agenor, the father, attempted "a rape" on the son's betrothed is in itself a foul crime sundering the order and harmony of the two families, on a civil and ethical basis. More importantly, that Agenor, who is the head of state representing both civil and moral law and order, should breach the divine contract has far-reaching consequences.<sup>7</sup> Because it is a twofold crime against the

---

the betrothal and marriage ceremony occur. Like his contemporaries, Ford invests the issue of love and marriage with a kind of philosophic abstraction, blurring the boundary between mystical and realistic spheres. Secondly, I refer to those articles which deal with the betrothal and marriage contract, mentioned in footnote no. 4 of Chapter III. As Carrol Camden summarizes, "It is quite obvious, then, that the marriage contract itself is the important consideration, not the actual service," and "Thus we see that the hand-clasp, the kiss, the exchange of rings, and the testimony of the priest, or other witnesses, are all part of the formal espousal" (The Elizabethan Woman, pp. 88, 90). I propose that one of these ceremonies did take place for making the contract between Palador and Eroclea binding.

<sup>7</sup> Elsewhere, the idea of a prince is expressed in The Sun's Darling. In it, Winter describes Raybright as the human deputy of God's eternal law and as an ideal model whereby each man is to order his own life (Act V). Similarly, in Fame's Memorial, a prince is likened to God's representative on earth who is to order society through the temporal law.

form of ceremony and by extension, against the law of providence, the violation and flouting of the ceremonial contract are a visible acknowledgment of the violation and flouting of the divine law and order. Such acts are considered an enactment against the workings of the divine principle. Agenor's action is against divine unity which contracts the world in one, for "The existence of anything depends on the union of the parts that go to make it; if they are scattered, it perishes."<sup>8</sup>

The play evolves around this conceptual importance of ceremony. When I examine the movement of action, it is clear that the correct understanding and the proper observance of ceremony are seen as the source of order and harmony and a guard against the destructive power of disorder and confusion in nature as well as in human affairs. Ford intends to persuade us of this point. This accounts for his lengthy presentation of the effect of Agenor's violation of ceremonial observance.

The outcome and the effect of Agenor's ceremonial violation on the Cypriot society are interesting in themselves, if we view them as an aspect of the workings of man's passions. As the play moves forward, Cyprus figures

---

<sup>8</sup>D. J. Gordon, "Hymenaei: Ben Johnson's Masque of Union," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 8/9 (1945-46): 106-45.

as a microcosm of the world, and the emotional experiences of its inhabitants assume symbolic implications. As Amethus says, "This little isle of Cyprus sure abounds / In greater wonders both for change and fortune / Than any you have seen abroad." (I.i. 113-15) While ostensibly written to cure the lover's melancholy, the play indicates that the remedy for melancholy does not lie exclusively in the mechanistic interpretation of Burtonian psychotherapy but, rather, in the larger recognition of the nature of man's emotions. There is Ford's assumption that melancholy is intrinsic to mankind, and under the guise of the lover's melancholy, he repeatedly compares the anatomy of melancholy to the difficult problem, particularly having to do with man's emotional life.<sup>9</sup>

By meditating and referring to both physical and metaphorical spheres, Ford deals with this ceremonial theme in terms of "discord" and "concord." Physical conditions are but the bodying forth of metaphorical meanings.

Sophronos describes the Cypriot society:

---

<sup>9</sup>It seems that Ford's affinity with Burton lies most conspicuously in their basic perception of the world as the melancholy place rather than Ford's partial application of Burtonian human transformation used in the "Masque of Melancholy." For both Ford and Burton, the figure of change is related to appearance-reality motif, and it is one of their methods of showing man's emotional instability in the melancholy world. One of the most perceptive analyses of Burton's Anatomy is Joan Webber's The Eloquent "I" (Madison, Milwaukee, and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), pp. 80-114.

Our commonwealth is sick: 'tis more than time  
 That we should wake the head thereof, who sleeps  
 In the dull lethargy of lost security.  
 The commons murmur, and the nobles grieve;  
 The court is now turned antic, and grows wild,  
 Whiles all the neighbouring nations stand at gaze,  
 And watch fit opportunity to wreak  
 Their just-conceived fury on such injuries  
 As the late prince, our living master's father,  
 Committed against laws of truth or honour.  
 (II.i. 553-62)

On the surface, it is the situation in which its inhabitants find themselves: the state affairs are in total disarray within and without. Metaphorically, of course, this is the outward sign of Agenor's passionate action: by committing the crime against ceremony, he has disrupted the whole scheme of things. More specifically, the human relationships among the Cypriot inhabitants are fragmented and disjointed. Namely, Palador, the ruler of Cyprus, is far removed from his people, neglecting his princely duty, which is to rule and govern; Meleander's household is sun-dered, thereby distracting his mind; Eroclea is in exile; Cleophila is a hermit; Thomasta's pride drives Menaphon into voluntary self-exile; Amethus has no chance to court Cleophila properly; and the Cypriot court is inhabited by fools like Pelias and Cuculus.

This concord-discord contrast is the way in which Ford builds up the case against the Agenor-like act of passion which affects the whole society. In so doing, Ford focuses in man's emotional nature whose characteristics

include instability and disorder. Menaphon laments the unstable and disorderly "Motions of passion":

Why should such as I am,  
 Groan under the light burthens of small sorrows,  
 Whenas a prince so potent, cannot shun  
 Motions of passion? To be a man, my lord,  
 Is to be but the exercise of cares  
 In several shapes; as miseries do grow,  
 They alter as men's forms: but how, none know.  
 (I.i. 106-12)

The play is thus shot through with the characters who know or are taught to know how to deal with the emotional "exercise of cares/ In several shapes." This is why Ford uses dissimulation as his dominant device. The unity of outward form and inward reality impinges upon the crux of the ceremonial ideal. At the same time, an assumed identity, often with the aid of sartorial and verbal stratagems, enables Ford to deal directly with man's emotional nature, under the aspects of chaos, change, fragmentation, or harmony. As Ford sees it, man is constantly under the influence of strong emotions, and such emotions are the wellspring of man's melancholy.

For the sake of the present argument, then, I shall say that Ford groups his characters roughly in three ways. One group is the equivocal case of dissimulation in which a character assumes a role and strikes an attitude indicative of his or her own emotional state. The role-assumption turns into self-conviction so deep-rooted that the posing

initially assumed can no longer be distinguished from the character's best or strong self. On the contrary, the posing is seen as an ethical character implicit in his or her nature. Those who belong to this group are Palador, Menaphon, Thomasta, Pelias, and Cuculus. For example, palador assumes the role of a melancholy lover. But the role so dominates his life that it obviates his inherent good nature and makes him a bona fide malcontent. The other group consists of those whose conscious, self-aware practice of dissimulation is a means toward a particular end. The posing for them serves to act as a guide to the proper values and desired emotional state. Rhetias, Corax, and Sophronos represent this group. The meaning of dissimulation of Meleander and Eroclea is more elusive than that of the other two groups. Since they are the key to the final restoration of order and concord, their role-assumption is not as ambiguous as the first set of characters nor as deceptive or intentional as the second. It is elusive in the sense that while there is dissimulation involved, it acts as a catalyst to the revelation of the whole framework of the play's action. Ford's forward thrust is therefore to show a learning process of the first group (except Pelias and Cuculus) with the aid of the second. It is the process of learning and restoring one's best self and the harmonious

emotional state relative to others and to the "Maker's architecture," to quote from Honour Triumphant.

2. The Movement of Action: "Perfect lovers are only wise."

As a matter of connection, the emotional movement of the play's action reflects much of what Ford advocates in Honour Triumphant, especially the fourth position, "Perfect lovers are only wise." The argument is based on the exalted theory and function of Platonic love:

Love is the only band, the alone obligation that traffics betwixt earthly creatures and heavenly angels, that unites woman to man, yea man to man, nay man to himself, and himself to God. Love is the dignity of man's worth . . . an earnest and reasonable desire of good, as authorities confirm. It is an entire conjunction of souls together.<sup>10</sup>

Applied to human affairs, this kind of love is most obvious in the lovers. The argument proceeds with the descriptions of a "perfect lover" who eventually grows into a wise one. The actual state of perfect lovers is said to be that of idleness: "never more busied than when least seriously employed." All they do is "to fawn, to flatter, to swear, vow, urge their grief, and to lament it," that labour which "Wise-seeming censors count . . . vain." The rebuttal to the "Wise-seeming" is that "love makes men wise," for it is not physical conquest but "ladies' honours" that the lovers

---

<sup>10</sup>The lines from Honour Triumphant are from the Gifford-Dyce edition, The Works of John Ford (London: James Toovey, 1895), pp. 343-80.



should ultimately strive to attain. Acknowledgment of the lovers' aim, that is, "the affection of some excellently deserving beauty," "admiration of the singular perfection thereof," eventually leads them to the contemplation of "the wonders of the heaven." They realize that their object is but a corporeal form "by which they will deeply resolve the dignity of God in that form." Thus, "love is the only line which leadeth man to the font of wisdom." The character of this wisdom is men's knowledge of "folly of humanity" and their own frailty, as opposed to "the omnipotence of their Creator" and "heaven's power." Fortified with the knowledge, perfect lovers become wise as well and "hourly do adore Maker's architecture."

Thus, the union of love and wisdom is presented as the ideal state of man in which human as well as divine concord prevails.

In the play, then, the three lovers--Palador, Menaphon, and Amethus--must learn to grow from being perfect lovers to being wise ones. In this respect, as one critic noted, the setting of Cyprus is significant, Cyprus being the reputed birthplace of Aphrodite, the goddess of love, beauty, and marriage.<sup>11</sup> It is the fitting place for the cult of perfect lovers. That the cult alone is not suffi-

---

<sup>11</sup>Neill, p. 87.

cient is shown, however, by their separation from the loved ones.

The problem of Palador, and, to a lesser degree, that of Menaphon and Thomasta, is that they cannot control their emotions of love. As a result, they cannot distinguish between appearance and reality.<sup>12</sup> By posing as the victim of unfulfilled love, they illustrate the blindness of love to the reality of their objects of love. In the case of Palador, being cut off from Eroclea, with whose union his true self reposes, he is at once a man in love and a melancholy man. Corax describes his appearance on the stage, reminiscent of a Hamlet-like figure: "A book! is this the early exercise/ I did prescribe? instead of following health,/ Which all men covet, you pursue disease."

(II.i. 622-23) His pose in feigning melancholy illustrates a kind of wisdom, a pose of a cynical philosopher, but it functions primarily as a parody of Rhetias' posture. At the same time, it reveals his mistaken attitude toward the domination of love melancholy over his reason, thus causing his mental confusion. Since he has lost the "True harmony" of inner self which comes "in consort, not in single strains"

---

<sup>12</sup>According to Burton, the passion of love is one of the causes (the other two are imagination and the devil) responsible for man's mental confusion. For example, love is described in this way in Part III.2.5.2. of The Anatomy of Melancholy (New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1927).

(IV.iii. 2102), his mental sight is gone as well. This is why he cannot see or even suspect the identity of parthenophil, the disguised Eroclea, when he is introduced to Palador. The extent of his blindness is discernible when we refer back to the scene that immediately precedes this introduction. Rhetias has just told him a "new" tale in a parable fashion pertaining to "a young lady contracted to a noble gentleman, as the lady we last mentioned and your highness were." (II.i. 772-74) The whole scene is ironic. While it shows Palador to be clearly a man who relies on visual signs for confirmation of truth (this point is later confirmed in IV.iii, in which Palador and Eroclea exchange tablets for mutual recognition), Palador cannot see that he is facing Eroclea in disguise. "A picture in a tablet" of Eroclea which Palador confides to show to Rhetias works as a means of discrepancy between what his naked eyes can see and what his mental sight fails to see. The degree of his condition and his confusion of appearance as reality are further externalized in the wild Bedlamite "singing and dancing" and men transforming themselves into animal-like states in the "Masque of Melancholy."

The "Masque of Melancholy" is at the same time the turning point which prepares for Palador's quick, progressive recovery from melancholy. Each step he takes displays the ascending degree of his mental sight opening up to the

knowledge of himself and others. Therefore, his reaction after the masque--"the very soul of reason/ Is troubled in me;--the physician/ Presented a strange masque, the view of it/ Puzzled my understanding" (IV.iii. 2070-73)--is immediately tied to the reawakening of his memory of Eroclea ("But the boy . . ./ For he is like to something I remember/ A great while since, a long, long time ago" IV.iii. 2073-78). The recovery of memory is quickly followed by his recognition of the knowledge of man ("but man, the abstract/ Of all perfection . . . in himself contains/ Passions of several qualities" 2097-2100). His emotional harmony, in contrast to the tyranny of passion embodied in the masque, is fused in his stylized eloquence in the masque of union, which leads him to acknowledge the working of Providence ("We are but fools/ To trifle in disputes, or vainly struggle/ With that eternal mercy which protects us" 2195-97).

Correspondingly, Palador's fellow lovers also undergo the learning process. Eroclea is left hidden in Athens, but her exile is a kind of moral education where she learns to remain constant and chaste:

this gift (shows him a tablet)  
His bounty blessed me with, the only physic  
My solitary cares have hourly took,  
To keep me from despair.

(IV.iii. 2190-94)

She also comes to know that the knowledge of virtues alone

is not enough but that it becomes complete only when  
reinstated with the loved ones:

Yet Athens was to me but a fair prison:  
The thoughts of you, my sister, country, fortunes,  
And something of the prince, barred all contents,  
Which else might ravish sense:

(V.i. 2641-44)

In this context, the episode of the ceremonial contest between Parthenophil and the nightingale throws another light on the degree of Eroclea's knowledge. Menaphon's narrative repeatedly equates Parthenophil with art and the nightingale with nature. Since the bird, unable to compete with the artfully played notes of Parthenophil, dies of a broken heart, it seems "the entire incident exemplifies art's triumph over nature."<sup>13</sup> The contest, besides being an ingenious clue to Rhetias' and Corax's roles in the play, shows that her knowledge is incomplete as yet. It also makes a sharp contrast with the final scene in which the musical echoes are used to symbolize restoration of "mistress, harmony." At this point, Eroclea as Parthenophil is not a harmonious component of nature, and her art is only a challenge against it. The meaning of the incident is indicated by such antagonistic, emotion-filled terms as "challenge," "rivals," "anger," "vie," "master," "controversy," "martyr," "conqueror," "funeral," and "cruelty."

---

<sup>13</sup>Anderson, p. 51.

In the meantime, Menaphon's problem--his inability to see Thomasta's proud nature--can best be seen in relief through her moral education. Thomasta, that "great-spirited sister" of Amethus (I.i. 230), must learn "to glorify her greatness by humility," as Amethus admonishes her. (I.iii. 435) Her fault is the passion of pride which prevents her from seeing Menaphon's love in its true worth. Her image is fortified by "ice" (I.i. 86)--the rigidity and coldness of pride, and the act of "falling" and "changing" (IV.i. 1710, 1738-41; V.i. 2285-89)--man's vulnerability to the power of fortune ruling it. Being proud of her high status and choice of freedom, she scorns Amethus' "loving commendation/ To your heart's saint, Cleophila." (I.i. 454-55) Her education begins when she mistakenly falls in love with Parthenophil. Her two laments over the powers of fate contrast with the extent of her learning. While the first expresses her defiant yet fatalistic pessimism on man's powerlessness over the workings of passions, the second attests to her humble recognition of the workings of Providence:

'Tis a fate  
That overrules our wisdoms; while we strive  
To live more free, we're caught in our own toils.  
(I.iii. 544-46)

O, the powers  
Who do direct our hearts laugh at our follies.  
(III.ii. 1508-9)

That her education is now complete can be seen in three steps. The first step is her acknowledgment of her blindness in relation to Menaphon ("Now I perceive the league of amity,/ Which you have long between ye vowed and kept,/ Is sacred and inviolable" IV.i. 1776-78). Next, she learns humility and gains knowledge of the extent of harm her pride has caused to herself and to others: "I have trespassed, and I have been faulty;/ Let not too rude a censure deem me guilty,/ Or judge me error wilful without pardon." (IV.i. 1780-82) The crowning evidence of her education is seen in that she becomes one of the willing agents for the restoration of harmony. First she sends Cleophila a letter which discloses the true identity of Parthenophil, and then becomes instrumental in the union of Amethus and Cleophila. (IV.ii, V.i)

Though Cleophila is the embodiment of filial virtue of obedience, she, too, grows from a forced martyr of circumstances and a sorrowful recipient of Amethus' love into a more effective personality. Her progress is seen in her transformation from a passive performer of filial duty into a tactful performer in the last act. Her final participation in the restoration of ceremony (V.i) is a testimony to her virtuous mind as well as to her tact, as she promises Rhetias: "I have studied/ My part with care, and will perform it, Rhetias,/ With all the skill I can." (2393-95)

she can receive as well as enact wise counsels.

The restoration of harmony among the lovers is vital to the restoration of harmony in society and in the universe. Ford makes this point clear when he uses different forms of ceremony in the closing sequence. They are theatrical ceremonies. As contrasted to the "Masque of Melancholy," which is more of the nature of the anti-masque, the musical echo scene between Palador and Eroclea assumes the form of the masque proper. The prevailing note of emotional harmony is symbolically invoked in the musical analogies, and it realizes a prelude to the beginning of Meleander's recovery of sanity. The social harmony is achieved by the public ceremony in which Meleander's honors are restored. Finally, when the lovers go "On to the temple! there all solemn rites/ Performed" and "Sorrows are changed to bride-songs" (V.i. 2723-24, 2726), the understanding or observance of ceremony is complete. The humanity is then put back to the fabric of the "Maker's architecture." The proper performance of ceremony symbolically demonstrates the lovers' growth in knowledge and wisdom. Ceremonial forms become the links in the humanity's alliance with the divine plan.

### 3. The Movers of Action: Rhetias, Corax, and Sophronos.

Rhetias, Corax, and Sophronos are the movers of the play's action. They are the instruments for the lovers'



growth into wisdom. The movement in which Meleander's distraction is cured, Eroclea restored, and the general harmony gained is important. In Act II.i, Rhetias tells Palador how, on the fall of his master, Meleander, he exiled himself in Athens; in Act II.iii, Corax shows Palador the "Masque of Melancholy"; in Act IV.iii, Eroclea reveals that her exile was arranged by Sophronos and that Rhetias has acted throughout as her "trusty servant"; in Act IV.ii, Corax reveals the cause of Meleander's distraction; in Act V.i, Rhetias and Corax jointly devise the Masque of Harmony. Rhetias also tells Palador later that Sophronos sent Menaphon to Athens "to remove the violence of affection" for Thomasta.

The degree of importance of the roles of Rhetias and Corax is foreshadowed in the mythical contest between the nightingale and Parthenophil. Both have the skill (art) to enable others to see through different eyes and to recognize themselves in the true light (nature). In combination, they become the persona of Burton's Anatomy, the son of Democritus the anatomist, who can laugh at human folly without fear of reprisal. Like Democritus, they continue the work of the anatomist who dissected atoms in order to find out more about the nature of man. To Rhetias and Corax, the atoms of Democritus are the miserable condition of humanity ("the exercise of cares/ In several shapes"), and

their function is to dispense proper knowledge of medicine and philosophy to help man cure the melancholy human situation and to rule over his own affairs.

But Ford carefully distinguishes the degree of effectiveness of their roles. Corax is the physician who offers a medicine for curing melancholy. His domain is to study and teach medicine ("in the university I have employments" II.i. 620-21). As such, he is sure and proud of his art (III.i. 1238-40), and others call him "a perfect artsman." (III.iii. 1964; also I.ii. 384-90, IV.ii. 1890) The insufficiency of his art, however, is prefigured in Parthenophil's art. Like him, he is a student of art. Inasmuch as Burton's Anatomy is to be, not to teach, medicine, he has to be the medicine for melancholy, not merely to study and to teach it. This is why throughout the play Corax is a curious mixture of complacency and self-denial. His humble admission of the "Masque of Melancholy" as "a scholar's fancy,/ A quab--'tis nothing else--a very quab" (III.iii. 1560-61) is juxtaposed with his sensitivity toward the power of his art: "princes need/ My art: then, Corax, be no more a gull;/ The best of 'em cannot fool thee, nay, they shall not." (III.i. 1238-39)

Rhetias, then, is complementary in what Corax lacks. His posture is that of a satirist. He regards himself as "a May-game," the role of the Fool who is licensed to criticize

and mock the baser side of society and human nature. (I.ii. 251) Like the Fool, he tends to disregard the usual laws of manners and speech (his neglect of careful attire, I.ii, and his constant abusive raillery aimed at other courtiers, I.ii). Also, like the Fool, he offers the art of the consolation of philosophy.

It becomes clear, however, that while Rhetias and Corax are allowed to be superior to the rest of society, their sense of superiority is finally not enough. We can see this in the way they abuse each other. (I.ii. 367-72, 374-77) The invectives point out mutual failings in them. Rhetias undermines Corax's superiority by referring to the ineffectiveness of his art in the practical sense. His is only knowledge and theory as evidenced in his failure in the "Masque of Melancholy," where the cause is found but not the immediate cure. At the same time, Rhetias' art of moral counsel is undercut by Corax. His superiority in the knowledge of human folly alone does not produce the immediate result, as Rhetias' counsel to Palador proves. (II.i) While Corax mistakes the physician's art as wisdom, Rhetias fails to realize that a superior moral stance is not wisdom either. Like Corax later, he must see that his counsel must be joined with the higher plan of Providence.

In the meantime, Sophronos' part in the restoration of harmony, especially his arrangement of the exile of

Eroclea and Menaphon, is a measure of his importance. His role contrasts his political counsel, even if it is a temporary staving off of the crisis, with the relatively more visible counsel of Rhetias and Corax. His ability lies in the practical performance of the state affairs, sufficient enough for Palador to assign him the task. (II.i. 565-68) But, however important his role may be, it is essential to notice that Sophronos' political wisdom alone does not produce the desired resolution. For one thing, the limit of his wisdom is shown in the condition in which Cyprus finds itself under his stewardship: nothing is solved harmoniously in political and emotional affairs. (II.i. 553-68)

It is only when their arts are joined that the tragicomic end is achieved. Though flawed in some way, they may be seen as different aspects of the "Maker's architecture." Indeed, in view of the final restoration of harmony to which they are instrumental, they can be taken as various workings of Providence, as well as Its factors. It is in this context that different appearances of Providence, such as "time," "hour," "fate," "destiny," "Heaven," are to be understood.

Under their guidance and contrivances, the lovers' growth into wisdom reveals the superior structure of Providence. Consonant with the theme of harmony, the benevolent and mysterious ways of Providence are insisted upon.

Amethus' awareness of time's mercy on Thomasta ("Time may reclaim your cruelty" I.iii. 470) corresponds with her first defiant and later contrite realization of the power of fate and destiny. (I.iii, III.ii) Corax's "Masque of Melancholy" reveals to Palador that "Heaven is full of miracles." (III.iii. 1668) Cleophila's unwavering trust in Providence (IV.ii. 2034-36) echoes her basic virtue. Even Rhetias and Corax come to realize the ultimate control of Providential power. Rhetias' blessing of Corax's psychotherapy on Meleander ("Heaven crown your undertakings!" IV.ii. 1830) is supported by Corax's recognition of the limit of human art without the protection of Providence:

'Tis well, 'tis well; the hour is at hand,  
Which must conclude the business, that no art  
Could all this while make ripe for wished content.

. . . . .  
the time is precious now.

(V.i. 2224-26, 2248)

Palador echoes the same sentiment: "We are but fools/ To trifle in disputes, or vainly struggle/ With that eternal mercy which protects us." (IV.iii. 2195-97) Like Corax, he at once admits the persistent workings of Providence and wisely submits to Its power. The final scene is composed of tableaux restating this central sentiment. The speeches of Cleophila, Meleander, and Eroclea jointly reflect emotional harmony and wisdom as realized in accordance with the Providential plan. (V.i. 2555-57, 2597, 2629-31, 2714-16)

#### 4. An Aspect of Melancholy (discord) and Harmony (concord): Ford's Techniques.

The dissimulation theme which often controls the unfolding action arises in large part through a cluster of clothing imagery and a variety of verbal styles. Ford's frequent references to the characters' attires and his employment of different speech patterns serve emblematically as the changeable, unstable condition of humanity. This is why considerable part of his attention is given to the examination of the outward forms in relation to the inward realities, the harmony of which is the cardinal feature of ceremony.

The use of clothing imagery, then, is central to the theme. Ford's pervasive use of such terms as those cited appears as descriptions of the characters' outward shapes linking those of the inward quality of their minds: fashion, wear, shapes, alter, attired, dressed, a new suit, crept out of, crept into, transform, change, contrive, turn, grow, shake off, hid, tailors, look, in habit of, clothes, rag, trappings, expose, disrobe, new-trim, conceal, nakedness, shift, purge, apparelled, counterfeit, shroud, garb, wardrobe, looking-glass, and raiments.

The clothing metaphor is first introduced by Menaphon to describe the mutable, miserable "Motions of passion." As he speaks to Amethus upon return to Cyprus from his self-

imposed exile: "Does the court/ Wear the old looks too?" (I.i. 93-94) To which Amethus replies: "If thou mean'st the prince,/ It does. He's the same melancholy man/ He was at's father's death." (I.i. 95-97) From the outset, melancholy is figured as a vast apparel enveloping the entire world. Specifically, of course, it is Palador who wears melancholy clothes. Ford seems to present Palador as a man with potential ("a prince so potent" I.i. 108) who has not yet learned how to wear such clothes properly. (I.i. 97-103) Palador's inability to deal with melancholy "Motions of passion" is further extended by Menaphon's subsequent lament of "the exercise of cares/ In several shapes," underlining the universal situation of man caught up in emotional instability.

At this early stage of the play, naturally, neither Palador, Menaphon, nor Amethus is aware that their problems are anything but personal. Ford, however, seems to be working toward presenting a curious double reality of melancholy --that it is a state afflicting man in love, as well as a malady pervasive among mankind. In this respect, the connection between the clothing metaphor and Menaphon's description of man's passions is effectively achieved, for just as man can put on or put off clothes, thus changing his shape and appearance at will, man is placed in the similar

flux and reflux of emotions, inducing man's destiny to change at will.

Once Ford establishes this basic pattern of analogy among melancholy, clothing, and changeability of man, he is able to bring in the characters whose responses to clothing reflect different approaches towards, and understandings of, themselves and the world.

The simplest case is Cuculus and his handling of Grilla. To Cuculus, man is a matter of changing clothes; that is, if he puts on new clothing, he creates a new man. He is the type of man who "begins the fashion," as Pelias describes him (I.ii. 285), but his fashioning does not involve any reflection of values or beliefs beyond appearance ("I have not a rag of love about me" III.i. 1210). His absurd attempt to change Grilla by dressing him "fantastically" is a mere parody of what man can do with melancholy reality, as Cuculus can handle clothes but only as manipulative, surface objects. Throughout the play, he remains ignorant of what it means to fashion a new man. The term "fashion" relative to Cuculus is used, therefore, to show the discrepancy between what he boasts to fashion and what he cannot:



But not of the ancient fashion, an't like your highness. 'Tis I: I that am the credit of the court, noble prince; and if thou wouldst, by proclamation or patent, create me overseer of all the tailors in thy dominions, then, then the golden days should appear again; bread should be cheaper, fools should have more wit, knaves more honesty, and beggars more money.

(II.i. 685-92)

He impossibly seeks to transform his and others' selfhood. He would be transformed into "a rare man," and he would have Grilla transformed into a girl by merely changing clothes. But he can be no other than he is, for he is emotionally dead, nor can he effectively alter others. Attempts at such transformations inevitably lead to failure, disappointment, and humiliation. When Grilla finally rebels against masquerading as a girl (V.i. 2371-72), the fitting recompense he receives is to be granted "some fit place about his wardrobe," so that "Whilst I'm in the office, the old garb shall agen/ Grow in request, and tailors shall be men." (V.i. 2380, 2383-84)

Less absurd but equally false are the clothes worn by Thomasta. Amethus describes his sister's proud nature in terms of cheap ornaments worn by a social upstart. (I.iii. 427-33) Ironically, it is Thomasta who devaluates herself and reveals the false view of herself, when she courts Parthenophil, "a stranger": "I expose,/ The honour of my birth, my fame, my youth,/ To hazard of much hard construction,/ In seeking an adventure of a parley,/ So private with

a stranger." (III.ii. 1369-73) The term "expose" is followed up by Parthenophil's subsequent expostulation with Thomasta and is extended to mean the need for her to grow wiser in relation to Menaphon. (III.ii. 1422-25, 1434-36) Repeatedly, Thomasta's vulnerability to pride is described as exposure, nakedness, and purge, and the power of her pride is described as "shifting" and "changing" the true worth of Menaphon, until she comes to realize her folly: "Pray conceal/ The errors of my passion." (III.ii. 1498)

The apparent connection between an inadequate mastery of the lovers' guise and their emotional and ethical status is more clearly made when we consider Rhetias, Corax, and Sophronos. In contrast to the lovers and Cuculus, they can manipulate clothing for a higher purpose. Their ability to handle their own clothes and others' may be intended to show that dissimulation is an inevitable fate of humanity. Life turns out to be a play for them. Using sartorial devices, they make both themselves and others actors in tragi-comic plot of the restoration of harmony. Rhetias' self-conscious choice to be "carelessly attired" (I.ii. 241) is only the role-playing of the satirist which he has to perform with the sanction of the prince ("Continue still thy discontented fashion" II.i. 819), until the right time comes for the resolution of the plot ("Henceforth, casting/ All poor disguises off, that play in rudeness,/ Call me your servant"

IV.ii. 1826-28). More interestingly, Rhetias allows himself to take an active part in a play within the play and engages in the role-shifting in the "Masque of Melancholy" ("enter Rhetias, his face whited, with black shag hair and long nails, and with a piece of raw meat" III.iii. 1580). Corax, too, has theatrical flash. He is able to change from a respectable physician to a would-be cynic by taking off his gown. (I.ii. 363-66) More importantly, one of Corax's efforts is to enable Palador to see through the causes of transformation in the masque in which various characters appear wearing beast-like costumes and symbolize to Palador his mirrored instability.

The theme of sartorial dissimulation is especially stressed in the scenes involving the disguised Eroclea. Parthenophil is at once the original creation of Sophronos (who transformed Eroclea into a youth by dressing her in sailor's clothes, V.i), the effective performer of the role of the youth under the careful guidance of Rhetias (up to IV.ii), and finally the re-transformed Eroclea coming into her true role as a lover and daughter ("Enter behind Eroclea in female attire" IV.iii; "Re-enter Cleophila, leading Eroclea and followed by Rhetias" V.i). Her metamorphosis is to cause an intentional confusion of appearance with reality on the part of Sophronos and Rhetias. Though in one sense she can be herself only, in another she is all the parts she

plays, because her transformation through sartorial disguises is invested with a special kind of meaning and function. Her sartorial theatricality, while it shows man's susceptibility to change and fragmentation of emotions, is intended to show the necessity of a self-conscious artifice which must harmonize one's outward and inward realities. Her disguise is as false as those of Palador, Thomasta, and Cuculus as far as her outward changes are concerned, but hers is a disposition which the reason and moral control of Rhetias and Sophronos command. Her artificial form of sartorial disguise is finally a means whereby the melancholy reality is transformed into a state of harmony and concord.

Along with the clothing metaphor, Ford also uses different styles to illustrate a series of emotional "crochets" (IV.ii. 1948) to which man is subject. The most conspicuous case is that to which Cuculus and Pelias are prone. Their courtly eloquence is only a parody of the controlled rhetorical finesse practiced by those who know the true courtly manner. From Pelias' flowery description of Menaphon's return voyage from Athens (I.i. 18-21) to the mock courtship of Cuculus ("I will court anything" III.i. 1212), their verbal style does not communicate genuine emotional responses. Their expressive style is an empty show and demonstrates the verbal folly of humanity. The seriousness of the nature of language, "which constitutes a referent reality for the men

living in it,"<sup>14</sup> is abused and brought to the point of confusion. They often manipulate word, style, and subject matters and consider them as things, for their verbal style is an extension of their foolish identity and selfhood. The false use of rhetoric is also discernible in the language employed by Thomasta in her courtship of Parthenophil. She pushes her perverse suit in a series of absurd analogies:

The constant loadstone and the steel are found  
 In several mines; yet is there such a league  
 Between these minerals as if one vein  
 Of earth had nourished both. The gentle myrtle  
 Is not engraft upon an olive's stock  
 Yet nature hath between them locked a secret  
 Of sympathy, that, being planted near,  
 They will, both in their branches and their roots,  
 Embrace each other: twines of ivy round  
 The well-grown oak; the vine doth court the elm;  
 Yet these are different plants.

(III.ii. 1385-95)

Her lack of verbal decorum is brought into relief by Kala, whose earthy comment punctuates the pretension in Thomasta: "What a green-sickness-liver'd/ Boy is this! My maidenhead will shortly grow so stale,/ That 'twill be mouldy: But I'll mar her market." (III.ii. 1311-13)

The mad language of Meleander is another example by which Ford shows human "crochet." As Ford externalizes Palador's emotional confusion through the "Masque,"

---

<sup>14</sup>Richard Lanham, The Motives of Eloquence (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), p. 1.

Meleander's confusion is embodied in the courseless energy of language which comes from chaotic passion. While the language of Rhetias and Corax, who are similarly prone to express their world views, is a calculated, self-aware commodity, Meleander's impassioned speeches are a parallel to the breakdown of his mind. Like them, Meleander scorns the vanity of human wishes (II.ii. 1052-64), and rails against the body politic of the state (IV.ii. 1875-80). Most importantly, his passionate speech is a sign by which the effect of the domination of passion should be gauged. In contrast to more rational explosions of satire, some of his speeches imitate the self-entrapment of a man overcome by grief:

Scorn to useless tears!  
Eroclea was not confined so; she perished,  
And no eye dropped save mine--and I am childish:  
I talk like one that dotes: laugh at me, Rhetias,  
Or rail at me. They will not give me meat,  
They've starved me; but I'll henceforth be mine own  
cook.  
Good morrow! 'tis too early for my cares  
To revel; I will break my heart a little,  
And tell ye more hereafter. Pray be merry.  
(II.ii. 1084-92)

The weight of his grief causes him to speak incoherently and childishly, outside the norm of a rational speech. When his style is controlled by passion alone, language becomes a dangerous tool which threatens to disrupt order and harmony.

Another verbal "crochet" is the stylistic dissimulation of Rhetias and Corax, especially that which they prac-

tice before the instauration of final harmony. The styles of Cuculus, Pelias, Thomasta, Kala, and Meleander are equal to what they are spiritually. But those of Rhetias and Corax are a kind of dissimulation which they use without losing their true identities. They carefully distinguish their styles according to the occasion and role which are required of them. And their verbal dissimulation is in total accordance with their sartorial dissimulation. Corax characterizes Rhetias' speech as "untoward plainness," and appropriately Rhetias recommends a plain style to Amethus: "Few words to purpose soon'st prevail:/ Study no long oration: be plain and short." (II.ii. 1095-96) But when he assumes a role of the satirist, his style is double-edged and protracted (I.ii. 367-73, 384-91), as is Corax's railing against Rhetias. Corax, too, dissimulates his verbal styles. As a court physician, he explains the symptom of melancholy to Aretus with a reasonable clarity. (III.iii. 1570-75) As a malcontent, he utters contempt for the court which does not appreciate his skill, in a tone of apparent rebuke to the prince. (II.i. 611-28)

Overlapping sartorial dissimulation with that of the language, Ford seems to put on display a discontinuity about melancholy reality wherein man is not the same person from moment to moment. Continuously, Ford presents his characters finding themselves confronted by the problem of shift-

ing identity, because their personalities are no longer stable but, rather, need to be continuously redefined. The sudden shifts in styles and clothes seem to illuminate the tendency of strong emotions that man is open to.

At the same time, Ford gives his characters the chance to strive for self-knowledge and self-control. Proportionately speaking, the play appears to be overloaded with melancholy and discordant emotions, but there is also another strand of metaphors shoring up his final theme of concord.

Opposed to the theme of dissimulation, there are images in which the foundations of the universe are mirrored. Some key words develop symbolic significance, both by their recurrence and by being closely linked to the theme of concord. In accordance with the theme of harmony, such words as light, sun, jewel, and fire assume metaphorical meanings. They reflect the unchangeable basis of harmony while adding beauty to the conception of harmony. Jewel imagery appears as the value of love and the constancy of honour and devotion of Eroclea and Cleophila. Thus, Menaphon assures Amethus that Parthenophil is the rarest treasure he could find in Athens:

A jewel, my Amethus, a fair youth;  
A youth, whom, if I were but superstitious,  
I should repute an excellence more high  
Than mere creations are:

(I.i. 122-25)



The same Menaphon, when he errs on the assumption that Thomasta has condescended to prefer Parthenophil, "a straggler" (an image of deviation, waywardness, and orderlessness), to his constant suit, satirizes her: "For I would never more look on ye. Take your jewel t'ye!" (III.ii. 1539-40) He means that it is a sign of false love and can be valued only by "woman,/ Which in her best of constancy is steadiest/ In change and scorn." (III.ii. 1532-34) But he is blinded by jealousy and a sense of hurt. The basic value of jewel imagery is restated by Meleander's mad and yet wise speech relative to Cleophila: "In this jewel I have given away/ All what I can call mine. When I am dead,/ Save charge." (II.ii. 1075-77) Cleophila's virtue is echoed by Amethus as he responds by saying that "My intents/ Are just and honorable." (II.ii. 1070) True love is also something that must be guarded with care. This meaning is conveyed when Palador says that this is what he has done during Eroclea's absence: "a secret, that hath been/ The only jewel of my speechless thoughts." (IV.ii. 2124-25) That love is the final restoring force is shown in the final ceremony in which Meleander's honors are restored. Meleander receives honours in the form of "a patent," "a staff," and "a tablet" in the order of their intrinsic worth. In this respect, Sophronos' speech reveals the power of love that is healing and protective of order: "From the prince, dear

brother, I present you this rich relic, a jewel he hath long worn in his bosom." (V.i. 2525-26)

The frequent imagery of light is associated with knowledge, wisdom, and princely image. The appearance of Amethus and Sophronos on the stage is hailed by Pelias as "now appears a sun,/ Whose shadow I adore." (I.i. 35-36) It is true that Pelias' speech is intended as an exaggerated mock rhetoric set forth by a foolish courier. But the line is preceded by "we that study words and forms/ Of compliment must fashion all discourse/ According to the nature of subject." (I.i. 32-34) It seems that Pelias unwittingly reveals the important roles of Sophronos and Amethus as moral counsellors. They are only "a sun," however, not "the sun," which must be figured in Palador when he attains knowledge and wisdom. Conversely, Thomasta's lack of true knowledge of herself is suggested in the lack of light and fire. Amethus compares her passion for Parthenophil to "false fires" and her pride to the absence of light and heat. (IV.i. 1706) Corax's art is praised by Rhetias when he finally realizes that Corax's art has become not merely theory but a combination of scientific knowledge and wisdom:

Corax, to praise thy art were to assure  
The misbelieving world that the sun shines  
When 'tis i' the full meridian of his beauty:  
No cloud of black detraction can eclipse  
The light of thy rare knowledge.

(IV.ii. 1822-26)

The glory of his art lies in its working toward the enlightenment of virtue, goodness, and harmony.

Perhaps the most significant function of light imagery is associated with Palador and his power to restore harmony. His potential for greatness was foreshadowed by Menaphon as "a prince so potent." (I.i. 108) Throughout the play, the effect of his seclusion is symbolized in the general gloom and darkness, wind and storm. For instance, images of clouds barring the sun and darkness appear to describe the fickleness of fortune, changeability of the heart, lack of knowledge, and separation from loved ones. (II.i, III.iii, IV.ii) Appropriately enough, Palador himself describes his potential power in light imagery:

Yet ye shall know, the best of ye, that in me  
There is a masculine, a stirring spirit,  
Which once provoked, shall like a bearded comet,  
Set ye at gaze, and threaten horror.

(IV.iii. 2051-54)

At this point, he is still apart from the company of wise counsel, for he repudiates others' assistance except that of Rhetias (IV.iii. 2065-66) and thinks the loss of Parthenophil was caused by "some practice, sleight or plot." (IV. iii. 2082) Palador's image as the sun and the light in the "echo scene" is consistent with the musical imagery and underlines the importance of harmonious union. Metamorphosed into her true self, Eroclea relates the events of her exile in Athens. She tells him that removed from Palador

"the bright sun of your life-quickenning presence/ Hath scarce one beam of force to warm again/ That spring of cheerful comfort, which youth once/ Apparelled in fresh looks." (IV.iii. 2128-31) Sacredness of harmonious love is further imaged in her protest that "The incense of my love-desires are flamed/ Upon an altar of more constant proof." (IV.iii. 2141-42) When the final union is achieved, Palador is symbolized in the form of a circle, an image of Platonic mathematical harmony, "eternity, perfection, God."<sup>15</sup>

##### 5. Ceremonial Resolution.

Ford's decision to treat the concluding sequence of the play as ceremonial formalism is certainly appropriate. Only by so doing can he gather up all the disparate elements and suggest his view about melancholy, love and wisdom, and truth and art. Earlier in the play, Ford has presented Agenor's violation against ceremony as the crucial point in the action. What follows is a bifocal illustration of the melancholy reality of humanity and the harmonious state that humanity, through the union of love and wisdom, should aspire to. The action thus mediates between this world and its follies, and a Providential, ideal world and its emblems. Ceremonial formalism joins this double vision of

---

<sup>15</sup>Gordon, p. 120.

action. It is Ford's deliberate theatrical artifice upon which "a truth of mirth and pity" is built.

The use of ceremonial formalism is anticipated in the musical contest between Parthenophil and the nightingale. Menaphon describes it in terms of two contestants, art and nature: the nightingale is "Nature's best skill'd musician," while Parthenophil is the student of art, "whose study/ Had busied many hours of perfect practice." (I.i. 154, 169-70) Like Honour Triumphant, which is a ceremonial jousting of four positions of love, the incident is presented as a ceremonial duel of ideas--the opposition of art and nature. The complex relation of art and nature is first treated by overlapping the ideas of an artist. There is Parthenophil, the lutanist, who creates his musical art. There is Menaphon, who recreates the contest. Lastly, there is Ford, the dramatist, who creates this scene based on his borrowings from the Strada and Claudian materials.<sup>16</sup> At the same time, nature is presented in the different aspects. The nightingale is an embodiment of nature's art and beauty ("silent groves,/ And solitary walks," "Nature's best skill'd musician" I.i. 135-36). Parthenophil is nature's human representative ("this youth, this fair-faced youth,

---

<sup>16</sup>Ford's marginal note cited in Bang's edition, Act I.i. 135-39: "Vide Fami, stradem. lib. 2. Prolus. 6. Acad. 2. Imitat. Claudian."

upon his lute/ With strains of strange variety, and harmony" (I.i. 146-47). Menaphon, as a nature lover, transforms a contest into a tale of "mirth and pity." Finally, Ford, through "The noble use of poetry" ("Prologue"), reshapes Menaphon's tale into a "truth of mirth and pity." But this overlapping and reshaping of artist and nature are not seen as a conflict of ideas nor as a distortion of truth. What is seen as a "truth" is the emotional experiences of "mirth and pity." While the nightingale's martyrdom seems a defeat of nature, the norm of all things, Parthenophil's victory seems that of human art approximating "their mistress, harmony." (I.i. 165) Despite its tragic end, then, the duel is an example of ceremony in which an appropriate form for ideas can effect what Menaphon calls "Concord in discord": "there was curiosity and cunning,/ Concord in discord, lines of differing method/ Meeting in one full center of delight." (I.i. 174-76) By mixing fact and fiction, a ceremonial duel can show an action as well as the final point of moral reference, which is harmony.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>It is a widely accepted mystery in the Renaissance that Harmony is born of the union of "a martial spirit" and "amiability." For instance, Edgar Wind cites "the unlawful union of Mars and Venus, from which issued a daughter named Harmony," in Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968), pp. 85-86. The state of concord and discord is also described by Ford in The Sun's Darling, Act V. In it, the four elements, the four humours, and the four seasons dance harmoniously to indicate

Fittingly, the musical analogy which predominates in this scene relates to the physical and metaphorical discord and concord in the Cypriot society. In terms of the melancholy condition of humanity, the ceremonial duel is given a special kind of meaning. The actual outcome of the duel is insignificant as its main purpose is to point to the play's moral orientation. The ceremonial form is a form wherein potentially destructive emotions contend and are contained. No matter how transient and fragile it may be, the ceremonial form gives a temporary halt to the changes and disorders to which humanity is subject. The ceremonial duel transforms the tragic tale of the nightingale into an allegory of truth and art, of man and the world.

As the ceremonial duel restrains and contains the shifting notions of art and nature, the ceremonial decorum of courtesy controls the emotions in what might be called the Masque of Union of Eroclea and Palador in Act IV.ii. The masque begins with two passionate but paradoxically measured laments over mutability, set like an echo with Eroclea responding to Palador. Their emotional restraints contrast sharply to Meleander's violent volley of outbursts against the iniquities of life (II.iii, IV.ii), or to

---

that all nature is in concord and that there is the possibility of concord between man and his universe despite disparate elements.

Cuculus' or Pelias' continuously meaningless eloquence. The decorous verbal formalism of Eroclea and Palador is a measure of wisdom in which they have grown. The Masque of Union compares to the "Masque of Melancholy," which is an index to Palador's confused emotional state. It also compares to Parthenophil's violent reaction to the nightingale's death. Their verbal restraint in the crucial and highly emotive encounter is an indication of emotional harmony. Again, the importance of harmony is suggested in the invocation of harmony, and one is also made to recall the musical analogies in the ceremonial duel of nightingale and Parthenophil. The ceremonial decorum, then, is not merely an elegant formalism: it is here to illustrate the triumph of rhetorical artifice over the chaos of the "Motions of passion." (I.i. 109)

In the last scene of the play, it is appropriately the form of state ceremony and the anticipation of the sacred ceremony of marriage that draw up all the elements of melancholy in order to make a final resolution. The form of ceremony brings about the emotional, social, and moral concords. Fittingly, it is Eroclea who is the binding force. It is she who appears in Menaphon's tragi-comic tale of "mirth and pity" as Parthenophil invoking musical concord out of discord; it is she who induces Palador to the way of



the proper knowledge of man as a unity of contrary emotions:

As there is by nature  
In everything created contrariety  
So likewise is there unity and league  
Between them in their kind: but man, the abstract  
Of all perfection, which the workmanship  
Of Heaven hath modelled, in himself contains  
Passions of several qualities.

(IV.iii. 2094-2100)

Finally, it is she who thus prepares the proper way for palador to restore concord out of discord in the Cypriot society.

The ceremonial scenes are preceded by the Masque of Restoration of Meleander, who is carried in, asleep, on a couch. In contrast to "his rough beard," "poleaxe," and "a frightful mask and headpiece" (IV.ii)--the outward signs of his inner distraction--his hair and beard have been trimmed, and he has been changed into new clothes. Unlike Cuculus, Meleander's outward changes anticipate the inner change which will be "wrought on" him in the final ceremonial scene. The dream-like quality of Meleander's distraction is enhanced by a boy singing softly of the shadowy nature of human cares and the power of the human heart and love. As he awakes to the soft music, he is greeted by Corax, whom he calls "bear-leech" and "this tormenting noise." (IV.ii. 2460, 2464) He berates him by saying that "all the hands of art cannot remove/ One grain, to ease my grief." (2483-84) But Corax, in cooperation with Rhetias and with the sanction

of Palador, is going to give Meleander a "cordial." The art now concerned works not only to the body (physic) but to the spirit (Eroclea).

The scenes that immediately follow show ascending degrees of importance, illuminating Palador's wisdom as embodied in ceremonial forms. Ceremony is used as the formal means to illustrate the proper conduct of man as advocated in A Line of Life.<sup>18</sup> When Palador was reunited with Eroclea, he has wisely reordered "the little world of himself" (Life, 392), and the inner harmony has been restored ("Thus princes should be circled, with a guard/ Of truly noble friends and watchful subjects" V.i. 2399-2400). Now, as "a public man," he has great political responsibilities to perform (Life, 399), which he has hitherto neglected. The public instauration of Meleander's honors is a measure against which Palador's moral stature as a prince should be judged. In quick succession, Aretus and Amethus come to Meleander, each bearing an object that symbolizes the will of Palador upon him: "a patent" which restores Meleander's former privileges and adds "the marshalship of Cyprus"; and "a staff" which represents his appointment as "Grand Commander of the Ports." Thus, political harmonies have been restored. The last token, "a tablet," which Sophronos

---

<sup>18</sup>The lines of A Line of Life are quoted from the Gifford-Dyce edition.

brings to him, symbolizes Palador as "a good man" who remembers that God is the "rewarder of adverbs, not nouns."

(Life, 409) The tablet signifies Palador's wish that Meleander "call him son, for he will call you father."

(2528) The bestowal of the tablet on Meleander, "a jewel he hath long worn in his bosom," formally links the tokens of "merit" (2685) with the token of the most important honor of love and wisdom. It prepares Meleander to accept Eroclea herself in an orderly, ceremonial manner.

The efficacy of the visual quality of ceremony is at work here, as it has been throughout the play's action (e.g., Palador's reliance on the visual signs of truth, II.i, III.iii; Thomasta's and Menaphon's blindness to the outward beauty and form of their beloveds, I.iii, II.i, III.ii; and Corax's and Rhetias' manipulation of outward forms). Therefore, at the sight of Eroclea's portrait, Meleander is suddenly brought to recognition:

Eroclea!--'tis the same, the cunning arts-man  
Falter'd not a line. Could he have fashion'd  
A little hollow space here, and blown breath  
T' have made it move and whisper, 't had been  
excellent:

But, faith, 'tis well, 'tis very well as 'tis,  
Passing, most passing well.

(V.i. 2548-53)

Cleophila's ceremonial introduction of Eroclea in person recalls the decorous reunion of Palador and Eroclea in the Masque of Union. As in that scene, the introduction is made

with rhetorical restraint and emotional control matching the newly regained inner harmony of Meleander:

The sovereign greatness,  
 Who, by commission from the powers of Heaven,  
 Sways both this land and us, our gracious prince,  
 By me presents you, sir, with this large bounty,  
 A gift more precious to him than his birthright.  
 Here let your cares take end; now set at liberty  
 Your long-imprisoned heart, and welcome home  
 The solace of your soul, too long kept from you.  
 (V.i. 2555-62)

Lastly, the entrance of Palador himself is heralded by the "loud music," betokening the solemnity of the final moment. The stylized gestures of kneeling and rising at Palador's presence (as Eroclea does in IV.iii, and Cleophila and Amethus do in V.i) is a physical clue to his importance as the human deputy of the universal harmony. The proper understanding and observance of ceremony will be completed, first when Palador receives Meleander's approval of marriage to Eroclea, and Amethus and Cleophila; secondly, when Meleander invokes thanksgiving; and to conclude, Palador himself gives a blessing on marriage between Thomasta and Menaphon and commands "all solemn rites" to be performed in the temple. (2723)

Agenor's violation is thus healed, and restitution is made. The anticipation of the marriage ceremony signifies a union not only of the lovers but also a more general union. It is the union wrought in the world by the power of love figured by the concord of music ("bride-songs").

In The Lover's Melancholy, Ford presents a world whose final order echoes the harmony invoked in the marriage ceremony. Instead of just imitating the chaotic world as he sees it, Ford aims to imitate the world of ethical and artistic harmony which ceremony ultimately commemorates. Perhaps Palador gives one of the telling illustrations of Ford's ceremonial attempt when he appears with the reunited Eroclea and strikes the play's summary image of the sun-king en tableau in Act V.i. As such, Palador projects not only his now well-attuned, harmonious self but also Ford's dramatic interpretation of ceremony in a concrete, comprehensible form. Indeed, Ford creates a series of ceremonial artifices in this play. The world of The Lover's Melancholy--and, in fact, the worlds of Ford's major plays--are able to survive chaos and melancholy, passions and emotions, only through the magical offices of ceremonial formalism.

## CHAPTER V

### THE BROKEN HEART

#### 1. Moral and Artistic Decency and the Ceremonial Forms.

The Broken Heart continues to develop Ford's Burtonian views of man and of the world which he introduced in The Lover's Melancholy, and also broadens his ceremonial formalism as a reflection of such views. A clue lies in the prologue in which Ford announces his basic posture about the relationship between outward form and inner truth. The play is purported to offer "a pity with delight,"<sup>1</sup> and with this promise, Ford sets the formal tone of the play. Moreover, the prologue supplies a useful insight into Ford's formalism which strongly echoes the Anglican ceremonial ideal. He heavily emphasizes decency, which combines and bridges both the moral and artistic domains:

---

<sup>1</sup>The lines quoted in this chapter are from the edition of Donald K. Anderson, Jr., John Ford: The Broken Heart (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968).

The Virgin Sisters then deserv'd fresh bays,  
 When Innocence and Sweetness crown'd their lays:  
 Then vices gasp'd for breath, whose whole commerce  
 Was whipp'd to exile by unblushing verse.  
 This law we keep in our presentment now,  
 Not to take freedom more than we allow.  
 What may be here thought a fiction, when time's youth  
 Wanted some riper years, was known a truth:  
 In which, if words have cloth'd the subject right,  
 You may partake a pity with delight.

(9-18)

Whereas The Lover's Melancholy is about the ceremonial containment of a general melancholic condition, The Broken Heart deals with the limits and breaking points of the ceremonial forms when put under the pressure of human passions. Instead of the sober voice of reason borne by Rhetias, Corax and Sophronos, the dominant forces in this play spring from Orgilus, Bassanes, and Penthea, all representing certain passions carried to extremes. As Calantha reproves those who continually interrupt the ceremonial dance, the workings of human passions keep disrupting the ceremonial artifice:

And cousin, 't is, methinks, a rare presumption  
 In any who prefer our lawful pleasures  
 Before their own sour censure, to interrupt  
 The custom of this ceremony bluntly.

(V.ii. 23-27)

Viewed from the ceremonial realizations of the play's emotional scenes, Ford's stress upon decency sounds like a plea for the decorous forms in which emotional truths must be shown. Ford's persistent concern with truth and his employment of ceremonial form in this play are,

therefore, entirely in accord with the apparent opposition of virtues and passions which the characters' names seem to imply. Indeed, the play is about the tragic deaths of certain virtues, the deaths being caused by human passions carried to excess. However, the tragic story is told in such a formal way that the effect of the tragedy approximates that of a tragi-comic "pity with delight," rather than Aristotelian "pity and terror." The use of certain human passions as a manifestation of man's fallen nature forms an ethical fabric of the play. But, in critical moments in the play where we see passions in ascendancy, these very passions seem to underline the special importance of the ceremonial forms that occur in these scenes.

With this view of moral and artistic decency in mind, I shall pursue two threads of ceremony which are woven in the action. One thread is that of the betrothal and marriage ceremony and the lovers' success and failure in it. This thread is of primary importance, because, functioning as the motive of the plot, it sets in motion the virtue-passion interaction implied in the characters' names. The betrothal and marriage ceremony--I shall call it the ceremony of love--corresponds to harmony in the emotional, ethical and social order, and the lovers' accord in affection is the most dramatic representation of it. The ceremony of love is the basis for the second thread of



ceremony which appears as masques, pageants, and other official public ceremonies. This second thread of ceremony --I shall call it the ceremony of conduct--reveals Ford's views of desirable stoic conduct: how the lovers should conduct themselves properly as they undergo the passionate experiences of love. Ford introduces the two cardinal virtues which the ceremony of love illuminates--moderation and restraint. Ford regards these ethical traits as a part of the lovers' orderly and harmonious love. The lovers' conduct, therefore, indicates one of Ford's larger interpretations of desirable human conduct even in the face of chaotic emotional experiences. Both threads of ceremony complement each other, because taken together, they illuminate the proper human relationship. They also suggest the values and attitudes Ford seems to approve in this play.

## 2. The Motion of the Plot.

The plot movement, which Ford announces by "The Speakers' Names, Fitted to Their Qualities," recounts his interpretation of the Burtonian World view, with the stress on man's chaotic emotion and his disorderly behavior. At the same time, it outlines Ford's alternative view that a stoical conduct gives an order to man's otherwise chaotic experiences. The scene is set in Sparta, the capital of Laconia, which is noted for its military valor and its

citizens' self-control. Laconia represents the province of stoic order. As in The Lover's Melancholy, an equally important place is Athens. It is the birthplace of Athena and hence is identified with the province of wisdom:

Athens - to Athens I have sent, the nursery  
Of Greece for learning, and the fount of knowledge;  
For here in Sparta there 's not left amongst us  
One wise man to direct; we 're all turn'd madcaps.  
(V.i. 1-4)

The close juxtaposition of Sparta and Athens, Order and Wisdom, is made apparent by the fact that Sparta is ruled by a king whose name is associated with one of the important Laconian centers, Amyclae, noted for the worship of Apollonian oracles. Ford's Sparta, then, should represent not only an active but also a contemplative metropolis, an ideal city-state combining Fortitude with Divine Wisdom.<sup>2</sup> As the last half of the above passage indicates, however, the Spartan order, which was maintained by the self-mastery of passions and a rigorous code of conduct, is going to be disrupted by a chain of events resulting from the passionate conduct of the youthful Ithocles. Orgilus, whose name

---

<sup>2</sup>Useful references on the Spartan ethic are: F. Ollier, Le Mirage Spartiate (Paris, 1933), especially vol. ii, pp. 165-215; Elizabeth Rawson, The Spartan Tradition in European Thought (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), especially "Introduction," pp. 1-11; E. N. Tigerstedt, The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, Uppsala, 1974), vol. ii.

identifies him as Anger, is compelled to take flight from the Spartan court due to the misdeed of Ithocles. Ithocles has achieved vengeance on the past enmity between Thrasus (Fierceness) and Crotolon (Noise).<sup>3</sup> It is a conflict between equally strong passions, with resulting misery for Penthea (Grief). She is made doubly miserable by the persecution of Bassanes' passion (Jealous Vexation). Anger purports to visit Athens, the domain of Wisdom, in order to modulate his emotion. (I.i) Instead of leaving for Athens, however, Anger remains in Sparta disguised as Simplicity, appropriately studying under Tecnicus, whose name means Artificer. His concealed stay is an ominous sign of the disruption lying dormant beneath the ideal order. Anger, ironically imitating Virtue, is incapable of being what the Stoics call eupatheia (right passions), which are akin to the virtues.<sup>4</sup> The first victim of Anger is Grief

---

<sup>3</sup>In terms of Ford's philosophy, as exemplified in A Line of Life and The Sun's Darling, noise is an extension of an unquiet mind, and, thus, lack of virtue. Accordingly, it is a part of the disruptive forces.

<sup>4</sup>Ludwig Edelstein, The Meaning of Stoicism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 4. Variations of the similar idea are expressed in: J. M. Rist, Stoical Philosophy (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969); F. H. Sandbach, The Stoics (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1975); R. M. Wenley, Stoicism and Its Influence (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963).

herself, as Orgilus contrives to meet the unsuspecting penthea in the palace gardens, where he discloses his identity and claims her as his own. His conduct thus signifies passion's tendency to compound and excite other passions. But, Grief vows fidelity to her husband and commands Anger to restrain himself.

Meanwhile, the Spartan order is to be maintained by Ithocles (Honour of Loveliness) and Calantha (Flower of Beauty). That virtue must be expressed via action<sup>5</sup> is embodied in Honour's victorious return from Messene, and is echoed in the equally meaningful crowning of Ithocles with a garland by the hand of Calantha. The incident foreshadows the natural union of the good Neo-Platonic virtues of Honour and Beauty, under the benevolent sanction of Amyclas, who represents a believer of the providential plan.

The difficulty of maintaining order soon becomes apparent, first when Grief reproaches Honour for his past indiscretion. Due to his indiscretion, Grief is made to appear "a faithbreaker" and "a spotted whore" (III.ii. 69, 70) in a forced marriage to Jealousy. The vulnerability of

---

<sup>5</sup>This is Ford's pervasive conviction already expressed throughout in Fame's Memorial.

of Honour to the hand of passion is further shown when Jealousy rushes in to accuse him of incest. Honour's own condition is represented by the discord caused by the sudden distraction of "this chaos of my bondage" (III.ii. 91), his "commanding love" for Beauty. Beauty echoes Honour's condition in her reaction to Penthea's plea in behalf of Honour ("Thou turn'st me too much woman / Weeps /; "Her fair eyes / Melt into passion" III.v. 43, 44). Honour cannot be himself without Beauty, while without their union, order is constantly under attack by the passions.

The self-destructive force of the passions threatens the marriage of Penthea and Bassanes. The tyranny of Jealousy becomes too unbearable for Penthea, who gradually loses her desire to live. Penthea also shows a lack of self-mastery over Grief, as her stoic stance becomes too much for her. She loses her mind, and finally starves herself to death. Jealousy's repentance comes too late, and Anger, too, travels down his own natural course of destruction. First, Anger exacts vengeance by trapping Ithocles in a mechanical chair and murdering him. But, then vengeance turns on Anger itself, as Orgilus pays his price by bleeding to death. The chain reaction of Anger's action spreads to Beauty, who, having lost her natural companion, Honour, dies of a broken heart.

Parallel to the disastrous effects of the passions, the ways in which Spartan order is secured and new peace is anticipated are significant. In Act I.ii, Amyclas, Human Wisdom, praises Ithocles for bringing "Triumph and peace," (12) thereby enhancing Laconia's Honour and making it "a monarchy at length." (13) The public Honour is celebrated in the royal sanctioning and familial blessing of the marriage of Euphranea (Joy) and Prophilus (Dear). Their union hints at the proper bond of Wisdom and Conduct, and so makes way for the final installation of Order by Nearchus (New Ruler). Nearchus, as the symbol of New Order, acts wisely throughout the play. Assisted by Trusty (Amelus), he conducts himself within the bounds of decorum as seen during his courtship of Calantha, in his treatment of Ithocles, and finally in his calm acceptance of Calantha's preference of Ithocles. He is the younger version of Amyclas whose statesmanship stems from his stoic execution of policy according to Divine prophecy, with the assistance of Appeaser (Armostes). The final reestablishment of Order in the alliance of Fortitude and Wisdom is confirmed in the last act. Calantha, in a public ceremony, arranges for the disposition of Laconia. Neo-Platonic supreme virtue Beauty commands the services of Order, to rule the entire Laconian monarchy, which supported by Appeasement, would be restraining and ordering Noise and Vexation.

### 3. The Ceremony of Love.

Central to this plot movement is the importance of ceremonial observance. More visibly than in The Lover's Melancholy, Ford appeals to the betrothal and marriage ceremony as a proper form which invokes the lovers' harmonious love. He shows this point, as Prophilus and Euphranea and Ithocles and Calantha formalize the accord of their love in the proper ceremony of love. The constitution of their formal betrothals is underlined by the necessity of vows in the ceremony, and with them, the sanction and blessing of Amyclas, the king, and Crotolon, the father. The necessity of betrothal vows is seen as Orgilus demands a promise from Euphranea that she will first obtain her father's and his witness:

That you will promise  
To pass never to any man, however  
Worthy, your faith, till, with our father's leave,  
I give a free consent.

(I.i. 93-96)

This view is further fortified by mutual vows of Prophilus and Euphranea:

Euphranea. Death shall sooner  
Divorce life and the joys I have in living  
Than my chaste vows from truth.

Prophilus. On thy fair hand  
I seal the like.

(I.iii. 87-89)

That Amyclas urges and sanctions their betrothal is seen in his "the marriage/ Between young Prophilus and Euphranea/

Tastes of too much delay." (III.iii. 35-6) Their betrothal is formalized when Crotolon and Orgilus consent to, and bless the marriage. (III.iv)

The love of Ithocles and Calantha is similarly ceremonialized: first, in mutual consent when Calantha throws her ring to Ithocles (IV.i), and then in public acknowledgment of it by Amyclas who, joining their hands, says "Calantha, take thine own." (IV.iii. 82) To Ithocles, he then says, "Thou'rt mine. Have I now kept my words?" (87) Later still, Ithocles says to Orgilus himself that "The princess is contracted mine." (IV.iii. 123)

These scenes are the dramatization of Ford's basic idea of order and harmony, of which the ceremony of love is his recurrent representation in the society. As in The Lover's Melancholy, Ford relates the lovers' accord of love as an instance of the emotional, ethical and political accords which the ceremony promises. In this play, however, Ford emphasizes proper treatment of the betrothal and marriage ceremony in order to weave another thread of his thematic concern. Since the world is a melancholy place and emotion remains an inalienable part of man's nature, social order and harmony depend upon proper behavior which imposes right form upon unstable emotion, such as the emotion of love. Society depends for its stability upon the proper formalization of the anarchic and potentially



destructive emotions. The proper formalization of the betrothal and marriage ceremony in this play, then, sensibly reinterprets Ford's more practical view of man's orderly and harmonious conduct which may guard the society and man against the threatening emotions. In the play world in particular, betrothal and marriage concerns Calantha, heir to the Spartan Throne. Thus, the proper observance of formal ceremony seems to represent that proper conduct which is required for the stability of the Spartan order and harmony.

The core of meaning overlaid by the betrothal and marriage rites becomes clearer, as Ford presents Ithocles' conduct: he has failed to honor the betrothal of Orgilus and Penthea, which is as ceremonially binding as the marriage ceremony itself.<sup>6</sup> The sin of Ithocles is twofold. He has violated the affection between Orgilus and Penthea, and with it, he has also violated proper ceremonial conduct by forcing Penthea into an anti-ceremony of loveless marriage to Bassanes. His act, therefore, is a type of improper conduct which disturbs the society's order and

---

<sup>6</sup>The persuasive analysis on this point is B. H. Blayney's article, "Convention, Plot and Structure in The Broken Heart," Modern Philology, LVI (1958): 1-9. Particularly in page 4, Blayney shows the binding nature of such a contract.

harmony. We observe this more specifically, as Ithocles' conduct brings about the tragic events which are matched by the conduct of the three pairs of lovers.

Indeed, the lovers' conduct reflects Ford's idea of proper conduct, of which their unions in marriage are its final celebration. People in love are more prone to the pressures of emotion. This is why, Ford seems to suggest, their emotions must be contained by proper decorum of conduct. According to the play's thematic formula, then, the betrothal of Orgilus and Penthea, and for that matter, the marriage of Penthea and Bassanes, are doomed from the start. Their tragedy is the tragedy of their unchecked violent passions, which are Anger, Grief and Jealousy. It entails their unhappy ability to dissimulate, compound and exacerbate the passions, which their reason should have brought to order and restraint. As such, Orgilus, Penthea and Bassanes represent the norm of improper conduct stemming from their incontinent emotions.

Despite his repeated protestations to Tecnicus that he will restrain his grief (I.i, III.i), Orgilus recklessly follows the dictates of Anger. His dissimulation as Simplicity is only a means to encounter Penthea in secrecy, thus embittering her situation. His ability to feign friendship with Ithocles (III.iv, IV.iii) is part of a carefully contrived plot by Anger to exact his final

revenge upon Ithocles. (IV.iv) The parallel actions of Penthea's Grief and Bassanes' Jealousy reinforce the corruptive behavior to which their passions are prone.

Penthea's revenge on Ithocles takes on the form of her intervention with Calantha in behalf of Ithocles' love for her. Seeing his repentance (" 'T had been pity/ To sunder hearts so equally consented" II.ii. 100), Penthea, like Orgilus, assumes friendship with Ithocles and succeeds in destroying Calantha's carefully maintained restraint.

(III.v) Penthea's lack of stoical self-control over Grief, doubly worsened by Jealousy, brings her to a partial madness, and in her mad language she suggests to Orgilus his plan for revenge:

Goodness! we had been happy; too much happiness  
Will make folk proud, they say - but that is he -

(Points at Ithocles)

And yet he paid for 't home; alas, his heart -  
Is crept into the cabinet of the princess;  
We shall have points and bride-laces. Remember,  
When we last gather'd roses in the garden,  
I found my wits; but truly you lost yours.  
That's he, and still 't is he.

(Again pointing at Ithocles)

(IV.ii. 115-122)

Orgilus quickly sees her meaning as he says in an aside that "She has tutor'd me:/ Some powerful inspiration checks my laziness." (IV.ii. 124-5) Following Penthea's plea, Orgilus waits until Ithocles and Calantha are formally betrothed and then kills Ithocles before his marriage is

consummated. Given the corrosive conduct of Orgilus and penthea, it is inconceivable that any measure of happiness could issue from their relationship. Ford shores up the impossibility of a happy union by using the pervasive images of lowliness, disease, pollution, plague, death and animals to describe the inherently futile nature of their passions. (I.i, iii: II.iii; III.iv; IV.ii, III: V.i)

More tragic is the union in death of Calantha and Ithocles. In terms of Ford's scheme of ethical traits, their mutual attraction and their eventual union are expected. Ford reinforces this point through Nearchus' desire to marry Calantha. It is entirely in harmony with Nearchus' nature that he gradually realizes the appropriateness of Calantha's union with Ithocles. Though Amyclas prefers Nearchus as a husband for Calantha, Nearchus quickly sees the evil in the enforced affection. As Amyclas tells him that "we have ever vow'd/ Not to enforce affection by our will,/ But by her own choice to confirm it gladly," he responds with "I come not hither roughly to demand/ My cousin's thraldom." (III.iii. 10-11, 14-15) More importantly, Nearchus recognizes Calantha as the perfect match for Ithocles' intrinsic nature: "one, to speak him truly,/ In every disposition nobly fashioned." (IV.ii. 201-2) As a result, he even goes so far as to support Ithocles' suit

for Calantha's hand in marriage: "To be jealous/ In public of what privately I'll further;/ And though they shall not know, yet they shall find it." (IV.ii. 210-3)

But in this melancholic world, man's chaotic passions control his conduct. Stronger than the force of man's proper conduct are the workings of his passionate nature. Ithocles and Calantha are not exceptions in this regard. It is true that they are the victims of the improper conduct of Orgilus and Penthea. However, they, too, act improperly. In addition to his violation of the betrothal ceremony, Ithocles is not free from other improper behavior which other characters understand is a result of his immoderate ambition. Ithocles' general conduct is reviled by Orgilus as "poisonous stalk/ Of aconite" (I.i. 46-7), fulminated against by Bassanes as "the popular blast/ Of vanity" (III.ii. 173-4), and scorned by Nearchus as "mushroom." (IV.i. 99) Moreover, Ithocles himself is aware of the obtrusive, self-destructive nature of ambition. (II.ii. 1-15) Similarly, Calantha is not free from improper conduct. When Penthea pleads with her in behalf of Ithocles (III.v), she acts rashly and eventually loses her royal composure. It is only later when they have learned to order their conduct properly that Calantha and Ithocles are united in the marriage ceremony. (V.iii)

The fulfillment of betrothal in the happy issue of marriage of Prophilus and Euphranea, then, stands in sharp contrast to the others. Prophilus' name has the connotation of "Favorable friend, one who favors friend," as Euphranea's name connotes "One who gladdens, gives good cheer." They are in love with each other, as much as Ithocles is with Calantha, and Orgilus is with Penthea. But, throughout the course of the action, their conduct never violates the golden mean, nor are their passions subject to sudden outbursts. As befits his name, Prophilus is always ready to recommend Ithocles' character to the best advantage. To Calantha, Prophilus praises Ithocles' military achievements as a sign of his intrinsically stoic mind:

Excellent princess,  
 Your own fair eyes may soon report a truth  
 Unto your judgment, with what moderation,  
 Calmness of nature, measure, bounds, and limits  
 Of thankfulness and joy, 'a doth digest  
 Such amplitude of his success as would  
 In others, moulded of a spirit less clear,  
 Advance 'em to comparison with heaven.

(I.i. 42-47)

In response to Penthea's lament and fear that human life is but a journey to inevitable death, Prophilus assures her of Ithocles' character equal to any severe trial of life:

He cannot fear  
 Who builds on noble grounds: sickness or pain  
 Is the deserver's exercise; and such  
 Your virtuous brother to the world is known.

(II.iii. 152-154)

While he is anxious about the change in Ithocles' behavior, he is too courteous to transgress the bounds of friendship, and he solicits Penthea to discover the cause:

Sadness grows  
 Upon his recreations, which he hoards  
 In such a willing silence, that to question  
 The grounds will argue little skill in friendship,  
 And less good manners.

(II.iii. 1-10)

Characteristically, his sense of moderation cautions Ithocles not to react rashly to Bassanes' charge of incest. (III.ii)

The same courteous consideration is visible in his relationship with Euphranea. Their courtship is carried out within the prescribed form of social decorum. Euphranea responds to his suit with corresponding sincerity and propriety:

Know, Prophilus, I never undervalu'd,  
 From the first time you mention'd worthy love,  
 Your merit, means, or person. It had been  
 A fault of judgment in me, and a dulness  
 In my affections, not to weigh and thank  
 My better star that offer'd me the grace  
 Of so much blissfulness. For, to speak truth,  
 The law of my desires kept equal pace  
 With yours; nor have I left that resolution:  
 But, only in a word, whatever choice  
 Lives nearest in my heart must first procure  
 Consent both from my father and my brother,  
 Ere he can own me his.

(I.iii. 68-79)

Using the language of moderation, Euphranea gladdens both Prophilus' heart and fulfills the expectations of Crotolon and Orgilus. It seems natural that Calantha urges their

union. (II.ii) Their union is that of two virtuous minds which do not run to extremes in spite of their difficult situation. Thus, they redefine the abstract idea of order and harmony as that of restraint and moderation in human acts. Not surprisingly, therefore, Amyclas complains of the delay of their union: "The marriage/ Between young Prophilus and Euphranea/ Tastes too much delay." (III.iii. 35-36) Later still, he persists to be assured of their marriage: "Is fair Euphranea married yet to Prophilus?" (IV.iii. 56)

#### 4. The Framework of Conduct.

Does Ford then Consider Prophilus and Euphranea one norm of stoic order and wisdom? If this is so, how does he strengthen specifically this ethical norm? The events that lead up to the fatal consummation of Calantha's "silent griefs" are of so singular a kind that the newly enthroned Nearchus can understand them only in terms of stoic acceptance of the Providential world design:

Her last will  
Shall never be digress'd from: wait in order  
Upon these faithful lovers, as becomes us. -  
The counsels of the gods are never known  
Till men can call th' effects of them their own.  
(V.iii. 103-106)

"The counsels of the gods" have mysterious and yet double-edged connotations which associate Apollonian oracles with a number of acknowledged "effects" in the play. One such



effect is the tragic undoing of Orgilus whose course of conduct veers from the guardian of Penthea's honour to the victim of his own lack of "courtesy" in his "craft." (IV.i. 138) One oracle anticipates its effect, and the effect itself, in turn, appears to submit to the oracle. Surely, Ford sets up the characters' knowledge of the Providential plan as the basis for their behavior. It is in this context, therefore, that Tecnicus' instrumental part as the moral councilor, especially his effort to decipher Delphic oracles, should be judged. His measure of importance lies, primarily, in his moral art, as councilor and practitioner of stoic moral tenets. In dealing with metamorphosed Orgilus, Tecnicus repeatedly cautions him to better his life in accordance with nature and in agreement with the world design:

Tempt not the star; young man, thou canst not play  
With the severity of fate:

(I.iii. 1-2)

Take heed thou has not, under our integrity,  
Shrouded unlawful plots; our mortal eyes  
Pierce not the secrets of your heart, the gods  
Are only privy to them.

(III.i. 9-12)

To Tecnicus, the world is governed by the benevolence of divine nature of fate ("just laws") in which virtue ("honour") is inherent. To live according to nature means to act well according to "real honour" which is grounded in the qualities of one's inner life. The order of one's

life, then, must proceed not from the indulgence in "the vices of our passion," but from the use of "reason" which must assist man to divine his place in the world and his proper course of action. (III.i. 30-51)

As important as Tecnicus' role may be, we must, at the same time, recognize the ultimately ineffectual nature of his counsels. This point soon becomes visible in the limit of his discernment of Orgilus' problem. First, Tecnicus is gullible and he is easily swayed by Orgilus' impassioned, sophistical eloquence. Turning Tecnicus' terms to his advantage ("I, most learned artist, am not so much/ At odds with nature" I.iii. 19-20), Orgilus cleverly argues for the need of an outward transformation. It is the moral education--to control his Anger--that he aims to cultivate under Tecnicus' roof. (I.iii. 7-14) Later, Tecnicus' suspicion of Orgilus' motive of returning to court is speciously cleared by Orgilus who assures him of his conduct on the ground of "mine honour." (III.i. 29) Against the energy of Orgilus' passion, Tecnicus' moral art is powerless and he offers only a passive exhortation ("Be well advis'd: let not a resolution/ Of giddy rashness choke the breath of reason" III.i. 1-2).

Tecnicus is wise as Orgilus often addresses him so, but Tecnicus' philosophy of wisdom finally depends upon the inspiration of Delphic oracles. He is only one of the

followers of Divine Wisdom. The relatively ineffectual art of Tecnicus cannot prevent the more potent workings of the various passions in the play. His warning to Orgilus-- "Let craft with courtesy a while confer,/ Revenge proves its own executioner" IV.i. 138-9--cannot effectively prevent Orgilus' disastrous behavior. Orgilus scornfully responds to Tecnicus' warning: "Dark sentences are for Apollo's priests;/ I am not Oepidus"; "It shall not puzzle me;/ 'T is dotage of a wither'd brain." (IV.i. 140.1) More fatal to Sparta is Tecnicus' inability to unriddle the final destiny of the Lacedaemon monarchy. As much hidden to him as from Orgilus and Ithocles, the Delphic "secrets of oracle" which Amyclas entrusted Tecnicus to counsel are withdrawn from him:

The plot is Sparta, the dri'd vine the king,  
The quailing grape his daughter; but the thing  
Of most importance, not to be reveal'd  
Is a near prince, the elm: the rest conceal'd.  
(IV.iii. 19-22)

In this Spartan world, the characters of The Broken Heart are persistently aware that they are the followers of the Delphic design. But, as the limit of Tecnicus' moral art indicates, Divine Wisdom is something of infinite inconsistency. It controls and determines human affairs, but it does not quite reveal the final mystery. In this dark Delphic world, then, human wisdom of the stoic life--

"according to nature"--assumes a kind of rigorous Spartan conduct which avoids an excess of emotions. What is required of the characters is to restrain and modulate emotion by reason. In this way, they can keep the self whole while keeping peace with the world.

This is why Amyclas' insistence on the union of Prophilus and Euphranea assumes a critical importance. Previous to this scene, he has just learned of the fate of Sparta, though the final mystery is enigmatic. Tecnicus' partial revelation has prepared him to the fact that disaster lies ahead. Unlike the futile temporizing attempts of Armostes and Crotolon, Amyclas accepts the eventuality:

Enough! although the opening of this riddle  
Be but itself a riddle; yet we construe  
How near our labouring age draws to a rest.  
But must Calantha quail too? that young grape  
Untimely budded! I could mourn for her;  
Her tenderness hath yet deserv'd no rigour  
So to be cross'd by fate.

(IV.iii. 23-29)

The connection between Amyclas' stoic resignation and his immediate command of "The bridal sports" is clear. If Amyclas cannot avoid the blows of fate, then all he must and can do is to insure the continuation of human well-being and proper conduct, within the scope of his ability. Amyclas' persistence in the union of Prophilus and Euphranea reinforces this point. His action also stresses a more important aspect of their innate character,

mirroring the similar trait in Amyclas. If a stoic sage can be defined by his moral expertise, then he should know how to conduct himself in each situation of like and take the proper measure to do it at the right time and in the right way. Amyclas' virtue--his sorrowful and yet calm reaction to the revelation of the oracle--reflects his appropriate conduct despite the paradoxical workings of Providence. Because the oracle seems to refer specifically to the double fate of Sparta and Calantha, Amyclas must take particular care to guard those who can enact and maintain the steady and consistent Stoic-Spartan code of ethics. Rather than giving themselves over to sudden changes and fluctuations natural to the people in love, Prophilus and Euphranea behave appropriately to the predicament. Their ethical worth lies not in the extirpation of their emotion and desire, but in their desire and feeling which are brought into balance. Their conduct marks the desirable stoic state, namely that of joy and discretion. For them, the emotion of love turns out to be a kind of exercise in the Spartan virtue of moderation and restraint.<sup>7</sup> Prophilus' admiration of the philosopher's virtue hints at this inner quality:

---

<sup>7</sup>Edelstein, p. 4.

Happy creatures.  
 Such people toil not, sweet, in heats of state,  
 Nor sink in thaws of greatness; their affections  
 Keep order with the limits of their modesty;  
 Their love is love of virtue.

(I.iii. 136-140)

If the emotional equilibrium of Prophilus and Euphranea is an attribute to the Spartan norm of conduct, then Anger, Grief, Dread and other extreme emotions are aberrations from the norm. As a result, behaviors stemming from such emotions are treated by the characters with frequent ridicule, reproof and chastisement. In fact, Ford meticulously presents those violent passions as noise and rudeness, and restraint and moderation as civility and silence. For instance, from his railing at the faithlessness of women (II.i. 23-9) to his accusation of incest (III.ii. 149-50), Bassanes' Jealousy is pictured as a paragon of noise and rudeness. Ironically, Bassanes is constantly conscious of the noises which surround him. (II.i) The gossip of the town by Phulas (Watchful, in the ironic sense) "Grate my calamities" (62) and Grausis' diagnosis of Penthea's state ("She is so over-sad" 73) are scornfully dismissed by Bassanes as "chattering." (74) It is Grausis (Scum--an image of decay and superfluity) who provides a sly commentary on the absurdity of Bassanes' Jealousy: "I am thick of hearing,/ Still, when the wind blows southerly," "Pray, speak louder,/ Sure, sure the wind

blows south still." (II.i. 120, 125-6) Together with phulas' tale of the fabulous transformation taking place in the aged Amyclas, Grausis' blunt language stands at the opposite end of Bassanes' groundless suspicion of Penthea's honour. Fittingly, Bassanes is susceptible to loneliness and quiet. As Ithocles requests to meet Penthea "alone within the palace-grove," Bassanes fulminates against Ithocles' use of the word "alone" and wrongly foresees an incestuous relationship. (II.ii. 109, 115-27) He steals up on the meeting place, but the pervasive quietness confirms his worst suspicion: "Sounds of such delicacy are but fawnings/ Upon the sloth of luxury, they heighten/ Cinders of covert lust up to a flame." (III.ii. 22-4) His rash action is brought into a ridiculous light as Ithocles reproves Bassanes' conduct: "The meaning of this rudeness?" (124); "But that I may conceive the spirit of wine/ Has took possession of your soberer custom,/ I'd say you were unmannerly." (137-9) Grausis adds to this point: "These are his megrims, firks, and melancholies." (155)

It is ironic that Ithocles chastises Bassanes on the ground of his irrational passion: "Well, sir,/ I dare not trust her to your fury." (III.ii. 190) In view of the primary cause of Penthea's misery, Ithocles is equally guilty of following his passion, when he fails to honor

the betrothal of Orgilus and Penthea. (II.ii) The persistent force of his passion is indicated as he commits a similar breach of decorum. Armostes takes Ithocles to task on the point of his behavior in front of the royal presence of Calantha and Nearchus as he snatches up her ring: "My lord, you were too forward." (IV.i. 37) He further cautions Ithocles to modulate his conduct by quoting the moral example of Ixion. Nearchus, returning to them a little later, mocks Ithocles' lack of "good manners" as that of "A gallant man-at-arms" (85) and stresses his lowly social station by calling him "low mushroom." (99) Ithocles' outburst against these aspersions cast on his character again forces Armostes to remonstrate with him: "Cousin, cousin,/ Thy tongue is not thy friend." (IV.i. 104)

Although it is more ambiguous and subtle in meaning than that of Bassanes and Ithocles, the demonstration of excessive passions of Orgilus and Penthea comes under equal suspicion and reproach by other characters. Orgilus himself knows the difficulty of containing his own everpresent passion. Spying on the courtship of Prophilus and Euphranea, he suspects her faithlessness: "There is not faith in women./ Passion, O, be contain'd! My very heart-strings/ Are on the tenters." (I.iii. 90-2) Paradoxically his dissimulation as Aplotes reinforces this very



difficulty. This temporary, fragile disguise for his "silent griefs" is easily pushed to the point of breakdown as his naked emotion is exposed to Penthea. But Orgilus' impassioned entreating to Penthea is in turn chastised by her as unseemly conduct:

Set thy wits  
In a less wild proportion.

Be not frantic.

Away! some fury hath bewitch'd thy tongue.  
The breath of ignorance, that flies from thence,  
Ripens a knowledge in me of afflictions  
Above all suff'rance. - Thing of talk, begone!

Rash man! thou layest  
A blemish on mine honour, with the hazard  
Of thy too-desperate life.

(II.iii. 24, 33, 42-45, 52-53)

Orgilus' impassioned Anger even transgresses filial decorum, as he counters Crotolon's pleading to accept Prophilus as Euphranea's husband. As Armestes must restrain Ithocles, Crotolon must restrain Orgilus for his lack of civility: "Son, son, I find in thee a harsh condition;/ No courtesy can win it; 't is too rancorous." (III.iv. 19-20) As a counterpart to Orgilus' impassioned mind, Penthea's otherwise pathetic laments over the passion's assault "On the unguarded castle of the mind" (III.v. 23) appear in an unattractive light to others: "Contemn not your condition for the proof/ Of bare opinion." (III.v. 13, 24-5) Her mad raving--the total release of her raw

emotion--is regarded by Armostes as the wilful act of self-destruction: "Be not so wilful,/ Sweet niece, to work thine own destruction." (IV.ii. 153-4)

Because the excessive passions are regarded as a sign of the perverse mind, quietness and silence are preferred as the way to Stoic wisdom. When repentance comes to Bassanes, he orders Grausis and Phulas to maintain quietness about the house, so that "No tempests of commotion shall disquiet/ The calm of my composure." (IV.ii. 8-9) Armostes is afraid that Ithocles is violating social decorum due to his ambition, and he urges on Ithocles a restraint which he believes will bring on quietness of the mind: "Confirm your resolutions for dependence/ On worthy ends, which may advance your quiet." (IV.i. 38-9) At other times silence is figured as the sign of a resolute mind, such as what Penthea exhibits in response to Orgilus' protestation of love ("'T is buried in an everlasting silence" II.iii. 69). Similarly, in recounting his witness of Orgilus' murder of Ithocles, Bassanes attests to his newly gained wisdom at the face of such a sad event: "But I have seal'd a covenant with sadness/ And enter'd into bonds without condition/ To stand these tempests calmly." (V.ii. 62-4)

It is true that silence is a double-edged condition in the play. Like the ultimate silence of the Delphic

oracle, the meaning of silence is sometimes ambiguous. To Orgilus, to endure "silent griefs" is not quite adequate to the truth of his emotional need. Despite his frequent resolution to remain silent (I.iii, IV.i), he repeatedly contradicts himself by breaking his self-imposed silence, and steadily embroils himself in degenerative, self-destructive conduct. Amyclas, on the other hand, chides those around him who neglect the bridal mirth: "But wherefore sits the court in such silence?/ A wedding without revels is not seemly." (IV.iii. 68-9) In spite of such conflicting manifestations, Ford's conclusion is that silence is adequate for the characters' emotional truths, like the awful stillness surrounding the death of Penthea. Like Calantha's "private griefs" and "silent griefs" (V.iii. 48, 75), Penthea's silence is figured as something sacred and inviolable. Not only does it embody the depth of her felt passion, but also it accords with her ethical stature. For only in silence and in silent acts is she finally able to accomplish the most powerful form of moderation and abnegation of her Grief.

##### 5. The Ceremony of Conduct.

It is within this framework of conduct that the second thread of ceremony arises. What Ford suggests seems to be two kinds of proper conduct. The first kind of proper conduct refers to the characters' behaviors and

self-images in firmly public values. Ford translates this idea of conduct into ceremonial scenes where a character suppresses high emotion and conducts himself properly according to the decorum of social convention. Propriety calls for a right form of how one's rank or self-image fits into the world in which one lives.

The second kind of proper conduct refers to the characters' behaviors and self-images in firmly private values. Ford translates this kind of conduct into ceremonial scenes where a character betrays high emotion and conducts himself according to the dictates of his emotion. These scenes depict the process by which the characters' highly emotional behaviors give way to the curiously ritual acts of silence and death. By elevating silence and death to the status of a stoical quietism, Ford creates ceremonies of privately-defined proper conduct, and these ceremonies hint at the fact that the human emotions are at once tragic and redemptive in their final resolution.

At the end, Ford's second ceremonial thread insists upon decency, a ready and finely tuned sense of what is fitting and proper in dealing with one's private and public matters. As such, it indicates Ford's sympathetic and acute interpretations of man caught between his emotion and reason. Ceremonies of conduct are the denotives of

Ford's stylistic tact, as well as his ethical decorum, which he desires for all the characters of this play.

Ceremonial patternings, especially those showing proper public conduct, are my first interest. They provide and support visually social decorums which express the desired Spartan ethics. Some of them, particularly those related to the betrothal and marriage ceremony, have been already mentioned. (I.i; I.iii; IV.iv) As Orgilus' epithalamium summarizes (III.iv), a happy marriage of Prophilus and Euphranea celebrates those whose orderly conduct is an outward sign of the emotional integration.

Another example of such conduct appears in the royal welcome and celebration of Ithocles' victory in Act I.ii. The scene is almost like a pageant, illustrating not only a state ceremony, but also the idea of honour which defines the characters' conduct. This formal ceremony is built around the stylized speeches and manners, socially determined roles and commentators.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, it is entirely fitting that Amyclas, the king, speak first, offering thanksgiving to "The Spartan gods" appropriate to his belief in the Delphic oracles, and then call for a formal

---

<sup>8</sup>A useful application of pageant to drama is Alice E. Griffin's Pageantry on the Shakespearian Stage (New Haven: College and Union Press, 1951), particularly pp. 87-133.

sacrifice to be made. A speech of honour immediately follows. He mentions the effects of Ithocles' Messene conquest in terms of its revitalization and elevation of the Spartan kingdom, as well as its public image. (I.i. 1-8) Notably, Amyclas extols Ithocles' military honour as deserving of "More than a chronicle - a temple, lords,/ A temple to the name of Ithocles." (I.ii. 18-9) Prophilus, as the herald of Ithocles' return, appropriately echoes Amyclas' praise.

The pageant suggests the nature of Ithocles' public honour at this point of the play. His public honour largely has something to do with heroic deeds, public ranks or images. It is not the kind of honour which entails the inner qualities of the mind Tecnicus prompted to Orgilus. This point becomes clear in the way in which a warm welcome is extended to him, respectively, by Amyclas, Armostes and Crotolon, all formally identified according to the strict hierarchy of the Spartan court. The ceremonial crowning of Ithocles by the hand of Calantha recapitulates such an idea of public honour:

Ithocles,  
Upon the wings of Fame the singular  
And chosen fortune of an high attempt  
Is borne so past the view of common sight,  
That I myself with mine own hands have wrought,  
To crown thy temples, this provincial garland;  
Accept, wear, and enjoy it as our gift  
Deserv'd, not purchas'd.

(I.ii. 61-68)

Ithocles' public image is enhanced by the fact that Calantha herself, daughter and heir-apparent to the throne, has made the chaplet. At the same time, her crowning foreshadows the natural attraction and exchange of hearts from which the more refined sense of honour proceeds. Ithocles' subsequent speech, given in the high style of court rhetoric equalling that of Calantha, betokens both a personal and an ethical bond which will later develop between them:

Let me blush,  
 Acknowledging how poorly I have serv'd  
 What nothing I have done, compar'd with th' honours  
 Heap'd on the issue of a willing mind.  
 In that lay mine ability, that only:  
 For who is he so sluggish from his birth,  
 So little worthy of a name or country,  
 That owes not out of gratitude for life  
 A debt of service, in what kind soever  
 Safety or counsel of the commonwealth  
 Requires, for payment?

(I.ii. 70-79)

Ithocles' rhetorical decorum and eloquence--a humble view of his achievements, followed by his high praise of his fellow soldiers' contributions--is introduced here to hint at the sort of emotional restraint he must practice. It is a sign of his inherent noble quality, which Calantha also exhibits during the height of her suffering.

The public ceremony of crowning the victor, then, must represent that proper conduct is to be maintained by those capable of combining the ethical sense with emotional finesse, and hence are deserving of all formal solemnity and verbal care. Similar consideration is discernible in

the royal welcome given to Nearchus in Act III.iii. Again, this is a pageant of proper conduct which Nearchus exemplifies in his decorous response to Amyclas' desire to make him Calantha's spouse. The public declaration of Nearchu's love for her is offered in the best tradition of courtly love, and Calantha responds in kind:

Nearchus. Report of great Calantha's beauty, virtue,  
Sweetness, and singular perfection, courted  
All ears to credit what I find was publish'd  
By constant truth; from which, if any service  
Of my desert can purchase fair construction,  
This lady must command it.

Calantha. Princely sir,  
So well you know how to profess observance,  
That you instruct your hearers to become  
Practitioners in duty; of which number  
I'll study to be chief.

(III.iii. 16-24)

Observing the exchange between the two, Amyclas encourages Nearchus by saying "Excellent cousin, we deny no liberty;/ Use thine own opportunities." (27-8) The same kind of social and emotional restraint which recommends Prophilus and Euphranea (I.iii) and Penthea in her early going (II. iii), is more required of Nearchus because of his status as a ruler. His conduct befits his princely rank, and we observe the similar examples of his conduct in his fair treatment of Ithocles (IV.ii) and his acceptance of the duty bequeathed to him by Calantha. (V.iii)

It seems to be in harmony with Ford's view of man that as the action progresses, the ceremonial patternings



of the privately defined idea of conduct overshadow those depicting the proper social decorums. The play's crucial scenes are a series of ceremonial renderings achieved by the processes in which a character's extreme emotion either destroys him, or redeems him. Insofar as Ford handles it, the emotional life--that is, the character's submission to his dominant emotion--defines the limits or strenths of his spirit and power.

The first important scene of this kind appears in Act III.ii. The scene can be described as the "Masque of Frenzy" of Bassanes. Ford begins with "Soft Music. A Song," and sets the theme of silence through stagecraft. The imperative of silence is emphasized as Prophilus enters and cautions Bassanes to withdraw ("Lord Bassanes, your brother would be private./ We must forebear" 29-30). The scene that follows is that of the first formal encounter between Ithocles and Penthea. It is almost like the "Masque of Conduct" enacted with studied restraint, with which they deal and come to an understanding of their past estrangement. Despite their highly emotive burdens, their passions are submerged and hidden behind a facade of decorous manners. Their verbal exchange is kept within the niceties befitting the status of an older brother and a younger sister.

Ironically, despite the great restraint exerted on

their deportments, however, the pushings of the passion's force are constantly at work. For instance, Ithocles must reprove Penthea for her forwardness:

Penthea. Who is the saint you serve?

Ithocles. Friendship, or nearness  
Of birth to any but my sister durst not  
Have mov'd that question. 'T is a secret, sister,  
I dare not murmur to myself.

(III.ii. 93-96)

Penthea's breach of manners becomes a catalyst to his subsequent disclosure of Calantha's name, and indicates the loss of restraint on Ithocles' part.

This gradual disappearance of their emotional check is a fitting prelude to Bassanes' frenzied, noisy entrance upon the scene. Silence attendant upon their meeting is wrongly taken as a commission of incest by Bassanes. He commits himself to the sway of Jealousy more deeply than at any time in the previous scenes by accusing them of incest. The charge of incest, like other modes of passionate conduct, promises much and yields little. Of special interest here are the reactions of other characters present:

Ithocles. The meaning of this rudeness?

Prophilus. He 's distracted.

Penthea. O, my griev'd lord!

Groneas. Fine humours! they become him.

Lemophil. How 'a stares,  
Struts, puffs, and sweats! Most admirable lunacy!

(III.ii. 123-125, 136-137)

This little scene presents a perfect dramatic image, like an anti-masque-like tableau on the stage, of the illusion of Jealousy and its actual impotence. Bassanes' incontinent conduct shores up the meaning of the passion's force throughout the play: the force of Jealousy, like the anti-masque, stands between Bassanes and his goal of silence. Bassanes is unable to understand the corruptive effect of Jealousy that isolates him from Penthea and other characters. Ironically, not until he satisfies his Jealousy by committing this utter folly does the reformation of his character begin ("Some way I must try/ To outdo art, and tie up jealousy" 205-6).

Ford uses a similar anti-masque-like form to describe the height of Penthea's distraction. Act IV.ii begins with the now reformed Bassanes who professes to learn to be "quiet." But, the silence is disrupted as Orgilus bursts in upon him and accuses Bassanes of having caused Panthea's madness ("Some angry minister of fate hath/ Depos'd the empress of her soul, her reason,/ From its most proper throne" 47-9). The subsequent scene is like a "Masque of Madness" which depicts the parting ceremony. Visually, Penthea's distraction is palpable as she appears on the stage in dishabille with "her hair about her ears." Her dress is an ironic description recalling her earlier avowal on her outward appearance that "my attires/ Shall suit the

inward fashion of my mind." (II.i. 98-9) The ceremonial crux lies in the juxtaposition of the formal gestures (the clasping of and the kissing of the hands) and her gradual verbal breakdown of restraint under the pressure of gathering grief. This physical contrast focuses the fruition of Penthea's deluded and yet simultaneously cathartic self-sacrifice. The paradoxical nature of her self-sacrifice is hinted at in the previous scenes. In Act II.iii, Penthea upbraids Orgilus for his rash breach of conduct as he renews his protestation of his love for her: in Act III.ii, she asks Ithocles to kill her in order to deliver her from being "A faith-breaker,/ A spotted whore"; and in Act IV.v, she succeeds in bequeathing her three wills to Calantha. All these scenes are carried out by Penthea's self-retributive logic that she is kept alive despite the dishonour done to her, and that since no one else helps her undo that dishonour, she must undo it herself regardless of the cost. The balance of her self-sacrificial desire and her Grief is held, though precariously, by her outwardly restrained language and conduct in these scenes. But, in this "Masque of Madness," the balance finally snaps. It reveals that her madness is induced by her incontinent Grief. It also reveals that madness is the only way she can find the total release of true feelings for Orgilus and Ithocles. The

responses given by the witnesses of this scene support this view, as Ithocles pities her and Armostes reproves her:

Ithocles. Poor soul, how idly  
Her fancies guide her tongue!

Armostes. Be not so wilful,  
Sweet niece, to work thine own destruction.  
(IV.ii. 123, 154)

The "Masque of Madness," then, is a ceremonial artifice in which Penthea's madness works as an object lesson on continence of the extreme passion. It also anticipates her final resolution in death. Her formal leave-taking of Orgilus, supported by her constant yearning for self-expiation, indicates that a heart broken by unfulfilled desire finds salvation only in death.

In the closing sequence of the play, Ford brings together the theme of appropriate social decorums and of passionate conduct in a series of ceremonial frameworks which are dignified by the ethic of dying. The performance of dying on the part of Ithocles, Orgilus and Calantha is accomplished by their rigorous imposition of order upon the chaos of their passions. Their decorous dying reinforces the play's patterns of proper conduct. Such an act also suggests the redemptive side of their passionate nature.

Act IV.iv enfolds a mourning, a mock coronation, and the sacrificial death of Ithocles. The theatricality of ceremony is physically evident in the use of elaborate

stage-direction, as it is in the succeeding scenes where similarly detailed stage-directions are given. As the scene opens, the stage is no more than a tableau-like scene of mourning: "Christalla and Philema, bring in Penthea in a chair, veiled: two other Servants placing two chairs, one on the one side, and the other with an engine on the other. The Maids sit down at her feet, mourning." The stillness of the scene is broken by the servant's cryptic words to Orgilus ("'Tis done; that on her right hand" 1). Orgilus already knows of Penthea's death, but he makes sure that Ithocles hears of it, by allowing Christalla and Philema to relate her lamentable end. Orgilus needs their dispassionate, echo-like recounting of the tale to move his revenge into action. The meaning of the servant's cryptic words becomes clear as Ithocles is caught in the engine. Like Penthea's logic of self-sacrifice, Orgilus' logic of revenge is motivated by his intractible commitment to Anger and, therefore, is relentless. To him, Ithocles has been the tyrant and the violator of the affections between Orgilus and Penthea. Thus, Ithocles must reap as he has sown. The mock coronation of Ithocles works, therefore, as the public declaration of Orgilus' private thought long nurtured:

Caught! you are caught,  
 Young master. "T is thy throne of coronation,  
 Thou fool of greatness! See, I take this veil off.  
 Survey a beauty wither'd by the flames.

Of an insulting Phaeton, her brother.

I foreknew  
The last act of her life, and train'd thee hither  
To sacrifice a tyrant to a turtle.

(IV.iv. 22-26, 28-30)

At the same time, the "throne of coronation" becomes "the sacred altar." Ithocles death, then, is as much a "sacrifice" as murder in cold blood.<sup>9</sup> To Orgilus, it betokens a sublime expression of his love, as much as justice done. To Ithocles, his death becomes the supreme moment to convince Orgilus of the truth and value of his honour. Hence, the moment must be treated with as much dignity and courtesy as possible. At the moment of Ithocles' death, they display appropriate attitudes, treating death with utmost decency. Ithocles prompts Orgilus to execute the perfect job of revenge ("Strike home! . . . if the wound close up,/ Tent it with double force, and search it deeply" 39-42), refuses to "whine and beg compassion," (43) and takes a heroic tone ("A statlier resolution arms my confidence,/ To cozen thee of honour" 45-6). Orgilus, in turn, recognizes Ithocles' moral superiority: "By Apollo,/ Thou talk'st a goodly language! For requital/ I will report thee to thy mistress richly." (52-3)

---

<sup>9</sup>For various interpretations of sacrifice, see F. Saxl's "Pagan Sacrifice in the Italian Renaissance," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, II (1939): 346-367.

Ironically, the scene of Ithocles' death is also the moment in which Orgilus realizes his own tragic flaw. His remorseless commitment to revenge turns out to be no more than a satisfaction of his Anger. This is the point that Ithocles' taunting of Orgilus suggests: "'t were a bravery/ Too mighty for a slave intending murther./ On to the execution, and inherit/ A conflict with thy horrors." (48-51) But, Ithocles also recognizes his own error in disregarding the Anger of Orgilus and the Grief of Penthea: "Nimble in vengeance, I forgive thee. Follow/ safety, with best success: O, may it prosper! -/ Penthea, by thy side thy brother bleeds,/ The earnest of his wrongs to thy forc'd faith." (63-6)

By the terms of the play, Ithocles' manner of dying befits his quality--Honour--in that it is his final subjugation of "Thoughts of ambition, or delicious banquet/ With beauty, youth and love." (67-8) It is also the supreme form of recognition that only in death will he find salvation ("In my last breath, which in the sacred altar/ Of a long-look'd for peace - now - moves - to heaven" 69-70). Only in dying with dignity and decorum is his unruly passion finally subdued and even conquered. Only in that final public performance does his truly honourable legacy



survive. This is what Orgilus' closing lament suggests:  
 "Sweet twins, shine stars forever! -/ In vain they build  
 their hopes whose life is shame;/ No monument lasts but a  
 happy name." (74-7)

What sustains the ceremonial dance and the ceremonial death of Act V.ii, are the same rigorous wills of Calantha and Orgilus. In the face of disaster, they deliver a consummate performance of Fortitude and Courage. Calantha's dance is a dance of celebration not only of the marriage of Prophilus and Euphranea, but also a celebration of her symbolic quality. Calantha assiduously observes the decorum of roles required of the epithalamic event:

On to the dance! -  
 Dear cousin, hand you the bride; the bridegroom must  
     be  
 Intrusted to my courtship. Be not jealous,  
 Euphranea; I shall scarcely prove a temptress. -  
 Fall to our dance.

(V.ii. 8-12)

Also, once the ceremony is begun, it must be completed. The sacredness of ceremony is heightened by Calantha's reproof of those who disturb the ceremony. (23-7)

The bridal dance, however, is gradually changed into a commemoration of Calantha's virtue, as one report of death follows another, and yet, her dance goes on. Her continuation of dance is merely an outward subjugation imposed on her mounting emotion, as she requests faster tempo of music in reponse to each report of death:

"to the other change"; "Beshrew thee!/ Lead to the next";  
 "How dull this music sounds! Stike up more sprightly;/  
 Our footings are not active like our heart,/ Which treads  
 the nimbler measure." (12, 14, 17-9) As privately and  
 publicly the assaults of passion are ceaseless, the only  
 visible measure possible to Calantha is to act out, not  
 verbalize, her sorrow. Fittingly in her dance, the impo-  
 tence of words is symbolized, for Calantha defines the  
 reports of death as "some hollow voice," "whisper'd," and  
 "murmur." (29, 37, 39)

It is at the moment of Orgilus' death that the para-  
 dox surrounding him is dissipated, affording us at last a  
 hint of his resolution. Not only is his ceremonial death  
 the moment for the recapitulation of his public and private  
 injuries, but also it is the moment of his salvation. And,  
 his salvation lies in his dignified manner of dying. The  
 impotence of verbosity is again stressed. From Orgilus'  
 terse report of his murder of Ithocles (aptly "laconic" in  
 view of his Laconian citizenship), Calantha's prompt exac-  
 tion of justice ("We begin our reign/ With a first act of  
 justice" 64-5), to his abjuration of words ("We trifle time  
 in words" 121), the performance of appropriate conduct is  
 urged and carried out. Again, the necessary fitness is  
 strictly observed: Calantha, excusing Crotolon and

Euphranea from the scene, entrusts the execution of her will to the court leaders. Since Orgilus' crime has both personal and political consequences, the court leaders in turn treat his death with extreme courtesy, appropriate to the royal command. In this ceremonial endurance of self-inflicted bleeding, Orgilus displays his mettle, and only in that show of fortitude does he come to terms with the play's scale of values. The proof of his commanding performance comes from the witnesses' responses:

Armotes. Desperate courage.

Lemophil. I tremble at the sight.

Groneas.      Would I were loose!

Bassanes. This pastime  
Appears majestic; some high-tun'd poem  
Hereafter shall deliver to posterity  
The writer's glory and his subject's triumph.  
(V.ii. 123-125, 131-134)

By enacting this loftier performance, he is finally able to accept the responsibility of his actions:

Nor did I use an engine to entrap  
His life, out of a slavish fear to combat  
Youth, strength, or cunning; but for that I durst not  
Engage the goodness of a cause on fortune,  
By which his name might have outfac'd my vengeance.  
(V.ii. 140-144)

What is more important is the fact that he is even allowed  
the acknowledge the futility and failure of his Anger:

O, Tecnicus, inspir'd with Phoebus' fire!  
 I call to'mind thy augury: 't was perfect;  
 Revenge proves its own executioner.  
 When feeble man is bending to his mother,  
 The dust 'a was first fram'd on, thus he totters.  
 (V.ii. 145-149)

The moments of the deaths of Ithocles and Orgilus, then, have a dual perspective: they afford the chance for Ford to describe the eventual outcome of private human passions, as well as to describe the public demonstration of ethical pre-eminence. It is fitting, therefore, that the play concludes in a public ceremony in which the coronation, the statecraft, and a marriage ceremony take place. First, we see a tableau-like enactment of a coronation. The solemnity and sacredness of the occasion are symbolized in "An altar covered with white, two lights of virgin wax," white robes worn by the participants and "music of recorders." Moreover, unlike the mock coronation of Act IV.iv, this coronation is accorded the correct, courtly deliberateness of manners. The coronation then gives way to the ceremony of Calantha's proper disposition of the Spartan state affairs:

I would presume you would retain the royalty  
 Of Sparta in her own bounds; then in Argos  
 Armestes might be viceroy; in Messene  
 Might Crotolon hear sway; and Bassanes -  
 Be Sparta's marshal.  
 (V.iii. 42-47)

At the practical level, Calantha's disposition of Sparta is

the sign of her just administration. At the metaphoric level, it is the Spartan virtue ("masculine and stirring composition" 7) casting restraint over the unruly passions ("demeanours, passions and divisions" 58)--a duality bridged in Calantha's bestowal of Ithocles' honours to Prophilus.

It is only after she has performed her public duties that she attends to her own private affairs. In the final symbolic act of the marriage ceremony, she epitomizes the meaning of the betrothal ceremony and the exemplum of her passion ("Bear witness all,/ I put my mother's wedding-ring upon/ His finger," "Thus I new-marry him whose wife I am" 63-6). The marriage fulfills the proper observance of betrothal. It also accomplishes the prophecy of Tecnicus ("The lifeless trunk shall wed the broken heart"). The marriage ceremony, to Calantha, is the public acknowledgment of her supreme love for Ithocles. But, in this world of chaotic experience, she can realize such love only in a stoical silence:

I but deceiv'd your eyes with antic gesture,  
 When one news straight came huddling on another  
 Of death, and death, and death! still I danc'd  
     forward;  
 But it struck home, and here, and in an instant.  
 Be such mere women, who with shrieks and outcries  
 Can vow a present end to all their sorrows,  
 Yet live to vow new pleasures, and outlive them?  
 They are the silent griefs which cut the heartstrings;  
 Let me die smiling. (V.iii. 68-76)

Her "silent griefs" (like those of Orgilus, Penthea and Ithocles) are felt all the more powerful because they are endured until death. Only in death they find satisfaction and fulfillment, as in the last analysis, death is the emotionally adequate form of wisdom--silence.

The world of The Broken Heart is populated by those whose relentless commitments to various passions create dramatic action. However, despite the horror and suffering presented on the stage, the final effect of the tragedy is somewhat distant and diffused.<sup>10</sup> This formal impression brings us back to Ford's prologue in which he refers to the stylistic decency: "This law we keep in our presentment now,/ Not to take freedom more than we allow." Along with Ford's strong sense of theatricality (especially prominent in the last two acts), his frameworks of ceremony appear to contribute to the creation of formal decency. It is true that human passions depicted on the stage are intensely real, but, at the same time, they are presented according to the inflexible code of ideal human conduct. Ford's sense of decency, then, must mean the kind of stylistic care which holds the most naked emotions within the

---

<sup>10</sup>This point is remarked by B. Morris in "Introduction" to his edition of the play (London: E. Benn, 1965), p. xx. Morris also mentions the ceremonial aspect of the play, and I have incorporated his comments in my analysis.

bounds of ethical consideration. Appropriately, the ceremonial forms are employed in those scenes where the emotional tension and intensity are high, only so that Ford can distance and even subdue the effect of the passions. The stylistic restraint and moderation which characterize those scenes, therefore, are entirely in accord with the ethical restraint and moderation which are hinted at as the final mark of true Beauty and Honour.

## CHAPTER VI

### 'TIS PITY SHE'S A WHORE

#### 1. The Structural Problem and the Ceremonial Connection.

Aside from the ethical problem involving Ford's treatment of incest, one of the important critical objections raised against 'Tis Pity She's a Whore has centered in its loosely strung structure. Madeleine Doran's comment fairly summarizes the problem:

Each of Annabella's suitors has a story of his own, yet each is drawn for no good reason, into the central confusion. The essentially episodic character of the plotting is concealed by a specious appearance of complication; specious because the chain of complication involving Richardetto-Hippolita-Grimaldi-Soranzo-Bergetto has nothing really to do with the main issue, the love of Annabella and her brother.<sup>1</sup>

Undoubtedly the main plot involving incest is an important one, and accordingly Giovanni and Annabella loom large in the center stage. It must be admitted that much of the largeness of their physical presence owes to their moral daring and to the compelling rhetorical adroitness they

---

<sup>1</sup>Madeleine Doran, Endeavors of Art (Madison, Milwaukee, and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1954), p. 301. Other critics of similar opinions are: D. K. Anderson, John Ford (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), pp. 104-106; M. Bradbrook, Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), p. 256.



display in pursuit of the perverse realization of incest. In fact, the seriousness placed upon the topic of incest is presumed from Ford's own apology in the dedication: "The gravity of the subject may easily excuse the lightness of the title, otherwise I had been a severe judge against my own guilt."<sup>2</sup> It is quite justifiable, therefore, for us to focus on the Giovanni-Annabella relationship and their problems. On the other hand, there is a question of how far we attend to their problems and of how much we do so to the exclusion of the other characters' problems.

It seems that our attention must be directed not only to the play's thematic meaning, but also to its construction as a whole. In this way, we may be able to understand more clearly the ambiguity surrounding the incestuous relationship.

The critical shift to the structural consideration clarifies Ford's ethical position in this play. Unlike The Broken Heart in which the various passions are refracted in the prism of Ford's refined stoic ethical absolutes, the main issue in this play is the gap between man's passion and its reality acted against the overridingly malevolent

---

<sup>2</sup>All the lines quoted in this chapter are from the following edition: Drama of the English Renaissance II: The Stuart Period, edited by R. A. Fraser and M. Rabkin (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), pp. 652-679.

view of a society sapped of its moral vitality and certainty. From Giovanni's almost comic and self-inflating illusion of love to Vasques' misguided idea of loyalty, Ford depicts the widening discrepancy between the characters' passions and their actual undertakings. More precisely, Ford explores the tragic irony accruing to that discrepancy. The focus of the play is not merely his consideration of incest, although it is the dominant dramatic force, but rather his tragic patternings of the characters' false visions and desires which are related to the equally false social fabric in the play. If we assume the incestuous love to be but one of the thematic variables, then some of the objections to its structure seems to disappear. Instead of loosely strung, the secondary plots and characters are integral parts to support and heighten the play's focus.<sup>3</sup>

With this structural assumption, I intend to show that Ford's tragic irony manifests itself in the several ceremonial scenes. These scenes unify theme and structure, and emblematically display the gap between the characters'

---

<sup>3</sup>The following critics find differing degrees of integration between theme and structure: A. P. Hogan, "'Tis Pity She's a Whore: The Overall Design," Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 17 (1977): 303-316; K. A. Requa, "Music in the Ear: Giovanni as Tragic Hero in Ford's 'Tis Pity She's a Whore," PLL, 7 (1971): 13-15; M. Stavig, John Ford and the Traditional Moral Order (Madison, Milwaukee, and London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), pp. 95-121.

visions and conducts. Ford's ceremonial structure is two-fold. One ceremonial structure is the misused, over-formalized, privately conducted betrothal and marriage ceremony in which we glimpse the lovers' flawed passions and inherent malaise. This is a radical departure from his mythical use of the ceremony in the previous plays. Instead of being an objectification of the soul-sustaining perfect accord in affection, the betrothal and marriage ceremony in this play becomes a distortion and veneer of that perfect affection, and signifies a fatal blindness to the futility of false passions. More ironically, the performance of the ceremony provides the lovers with the paradoxical combination of the freedom of their individual passions and the imprisonment by them. Namely, the presumably soul-freeing ceremony traps and threatens them due to societal forces or to their emotional uncertainty and divisiveness. I shall call this structure the ceremony of concealment. It is a series of anti-ceremonies to the betrothal and marriage ceremony.

But this ceremony of concealment--the false use of betrothal and marriage rites--becomes a component of the more generalized form of human behavior. It is inseparably joined by another larger ceremonial structure in which the lovers are shown as part of the general malaise pervading this play. This larger structure, which I call the ceremony of revelation, appears as a series of counter-ceremonies and

assumes the form of masques, banquet, ecclesiastic trials, and tableaux of self-declamation. The ceremony of revelation is the ironic crux of the play. In those scenes, the characters betray, under the pretext of obtaining honor and vengeance, their secret acts and desires and thus disclose publicly the limits and the falsity of their visions and conducts. More precisely, those counter-ceremonies demonstrate the tragic crevice separating the characters' aspirations from their actual capabilities, their moral fervor from their moral corruption. Out of this conflation of private ceremonies of concealment and public ceremonies of disclosure, Ford is able to present a tragic view of a world--one in which both the characters and their values are defined by those limitations and failings. It is a world view in which the limits of man's capabilities and aspirations are interrelated to the limits and failings of the society's inherently negating values.

## 2. The Ceremony of Concealment: A Pattern of Anti-Ceremonies.

This darker, grimly faulty world of the play is first suggested in a number of equally faulty microcosms which the lovers create by performing their ceremony of concealment. This thread of ceremony depicts a way of the lovers' involvement in this world, and sets off their career from initial offense towards eventual corruption and annihilation.

lation. It focuses on the lovers' offense against the proper employment of betrothal and marriage rites. It also creates the confining, secretive environment which, resulting from that offense, gives them with motives of revenge and honor. Thus, the lovers first become the offenders of the norm of all right affection and conduct.

The greatest offender is Giovanni, who is absolute in his incestuous love. Having one theme in mind--the Neoplatonic vision of love as embodied in Annabella--he defies the laws of reality on all levels of being: individual, social, divine. Furthermore, he attempts to revise the whole traditional scheme of things, and to revise the laws of God in accordance with his own moral scheme. He thus elevates his lust and himself to the status of "god" (I.i. 84), empowered with supreme ceremonial prerogatives. The opening scene (I.i) of disputation between himself and the friar illuminates his moral philosophy of love and prepares us for his subsequent commission of the marriage ceremony. The friar's objection to Giovanni reveals the traditional ceremonial basis according to tradition and the general scheme of things: man must love and marry in the harmonious and equal unity among the god-decreed laws of reason, religion, and nature. (2-10)

Giovanni develops his private argument. He turns the friar's commonplaces to his advantage and applies the gener-

al truths to his own particular case. What these laws decree is "a peevish sound,/ A customary form," if Giovanni, as "all men else may, love." (25-9) He attacks the insufficiency of the traditional laws which prohibit him from "prais/ing/ / That beauty which, if framed anew, the god/ Would make a god of, if they had it there/ And kneel to it, as I do kneel to them." (21-3) Like his fellow Neoplatonists,<sup>4</sup> he bases his argument on the essential aspect of love --the super-cosmic beauty of Annabella. In arguing from the all embracing idealization of beauty, Giovanni presents incest as a new law of reason, religion, and nature:

Say that we had one father, say one womb  
 (Curse to my joys) gave both us life and birth:  
 Are we not therefore each to other bound  
 So much the more by nature by the links  
 Of blood, of reason - nay, if you will have't,  
 Even of religion - to be ever one:  
 One soul, one flesh, one love, one heart, one all?  
 (I.i. 28-34)

Logically, his argument revises the frozen commonplace truths of the friar's nature, reason, and religion. Rhetorically, it facilitates an easy transition from the friar's general assumption of love ("Yes, you may love" 20) to his conclusion of incest. Sophistically it serves his purpose of temptation and seduction for incest by arguing that

---

<sup>4</sup>Useful references on the love treatises are: J. C. Nelson, Renaissance Theory of Love (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958); J. S. Harrison, Platonism in English Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (New York: Columbia University Press, 1903).

love depends primarily on philosophical possibilities of love rather than the values and limits imposed by nature. In appealing to beauty and birthright as the grounds for incest, Giovanni succeeds in establishing his grand basis of affection and conduct.

But, his offense is clear, for he confuses the ground of ceremony by supplanting lust with love. Giovanni betrays the confusion between his myth of love and its reality, when he asks the friar, "Shall, then, for that I am her brother born,/ My joys be ever banished from her bed?" (26-27) Brief though it is, the question reveals the paradox of his idea of love, especially a paradox in the human embodiment of it. Not only does the question show the limits of his spiritual concept of love, but also it defines his physical execution of love in the immediate satisfaction of sensuality. It is apt, therefore, that the friar flatly condemns his confusion as "thy unranged - almost - blasphemy" (44) and he bluntly exposes the unmistakable lust beneath Giovanni's rhetorical sophistry.

Giovanni's offense transcends more than just his revision of orthodoxy. This the friar sees in the dormant danger in his impassioned rhetorical nature. Giovanni has embarked on an ethical defiance in a rhetorical style which laboriously builds up a potential world made of hyperbole, insofar as he sets out to outdo crabbed orthodoxy.

"Hyperbole by its very nature resists death: it is the 'overreacher', as Puttenham described it, aspiring to immortality and the power of the gods."<sup>5</sup> As a representative of religion, the friar aptly sees the correspondence between Giovanni's hyperbolic style and his re-working of morality. By his very rhetorical tendency, Giovanni is faced with a dilemma between romantic law (his vision of incest as unattained spiritual possibilities) and traditional truth (his refusal of incest as lust). By choosing a style rich in hyperbole, Giovanni is attempting to rival and surpass mortal nature, both moral and rhetorical. It is fitting, then, that the friar inexorably makes his position clear: God forbids incest and will punish "thy willful flames." (66) For Giovanni to continue in this desire is to "converse with lust and death" (58) - his spiritual death - unless he abandons "the leprosy of lust" (74) and learns the truth.

Giovanni chooses to defy spiritual death, instead of being contrite. Yet, to defy such a death convincingly is important if he is to show his ability to overcome what the real world deems irreligious, irrational, and unnatural, and to continue to create a world of his own which can resist such a death. This is why the last lines of the scene ("All this I'll do, to free me from the rod/ Of vengeance; else

---

<sup>5</sup>Lucy Gent, "'Venus and Adonis': The Triumph of Rhetoric," Modern Language Review, 69 (1974): 727.



I'll swear my fate's my god") (83-4) are important in that they point to Giovanni's central offense against ceremony. For, by elevating his lust into his fate and his fate into deity, he has made himself a godhead. He discards orthodoxy and indiscriminately blurs the distinction between "lust" and "fate." By so doing, he accords his lust a kind of mythical status. Giovanni becomes not only the agent but also the architect of romance and myth wherein the newly deified lust ("this idol" according to the friar) is recast into a general deity. Giovanni's self-deification is echoed by Annabella who envisions him as "blessed shape/ Of some celestial creature." (I.ii. 135) In turn, she becomes a divinity ("The poets feign, I read,/ That Juno for her forehead did exceed/ All other goddesses; but I durst swear/ Your forehead exceeds hers"). (I.ii. 195-98) In their romantic world, they have virtually become a god and a goddess who are above common law.

By the terms of Giovanni's ceremonial assumption, the performance of the marriage ceremony at the end of Act I.ii means a natural arrogation of his divine powers. It is a symbol signifying his implementation of incest as the ideal love envisioned in Annabella. As a result, no ordinary ceremony is sufficient to him. Rather, he devises his own mode of ceremony, by disregarding social decorum and the bounds of natural human bond. The beauty of his ceremony is

undeniable. Ironically, the echo-like exchange of consent and vows reminds us of the similar scene in The Lover's Melancholy which recreates a sensible, ceremonial copy of the concord in affection and conduct between Palador and Eroclea. In contrast, a sense of fragility prevails in the union of Giovanni and Annabella--such fragility is not evident in the harmonious union of Palador and Eroclea. In effect, the strictly ceremonial manner by which they perform the marriage only underlines the true meaning of their offense. The formal grace of ceremony is enhanced by the gesture of kneeling and the mutual recitation of impromptu vows. But, such a ceremony turns itself into an ironic comment on their wrong decision to dissimulate a sacred rite based on a perverse understanding of love and being.

Less presumptuous, but equally reprehensible, is the offense by other lovers. The secrecy, deception and expediency that characterize the union of Giovanni and Annabella are equally characteristic of the other lovers' modes of ceremony. The union of Soranzo and Hippolita is marked by pervasive hypocrisy and abuse of the marriage vows. Hippolita accuses Soranzo in Act II.ii, of perjury, dissimulation and broken vows. As she demands the fulfillment of vows to marry, Soranzo in turn counters her charge by pointing out how far she herself was responsible for the breach of vows made to Richardetto:

The vows I made, if you remember well,  
 Were wicked and unlawful; 'twere more sin  
 To keep them than to break them. As for me,  
 I cannot mask my penitence. Think thou  
 How much thou hast digressed from honest shame  
 In bringing of a gentleman to death  
 Who was thy husband;

(II.ii. 86-92)

The durability of their union hinges on the duration during which their mutual vows are honored and kept on the basis of love. Once broken, the vows turn love into mutual lust and hatred.

Interestingly, Hippolita uses the same guile to tempt Vasques as did Soranzo. Using union in marriage as a bait, she engages Vasques' assistance to achieve her revenge on Soranzo. (II.ii. 153-56)

Even more sinister is the union of Soranzo and Annabella. First we hear of the forthcoming union in the form of report by Richardetto (III.v. 8-13) In the following scene, we see the betrothal ceremony performed, but only after we witness Annabella's confession of guilt over her incestuous act:

Friar. My Lord Soranzo, here  
 Give me your hand; for that I give you this.  
 (Joins their hands)

Soranzo. Lady say you so too?

Annabella. I do, and vow  
 To live with you and yours.

Friar. Timely resolved:  
 My blessing rest on both; more to be done,  
 You may perform it on the morning sun.  
 (III.vi. 50-57)

As for the actual marriage ceremony, we only have the words of the friar's report that the deed was done: "These holy rites performed, now take your times/ To spend the remnant of the day in feast." (IV.i. 1-2)

Despite the parental consent and the participation of an ecclesiastic, their union is fallacious in two ways. Annabella agrees to the union, not out of genuine affection for Soranzo, but out of necessity ("she is with child" III. iii. 8) and out of desire to preserve her social self-image ("'twas not for love/ I chose you, but for honor" IV.iii. 22-25). Marriage to her is merely a means to escape social disgrace and to show a measure of repentance. In the meantime, Soranzo's vow is questionable, despite his protestations of love for Annabella (II.ii, III.iii), as he has already broken the vows he had with Hippolita.

All these ceremonial offenses are brought into pathetic relief by the intended union of Bergetto and Philotis. Their ceremonial union is even more crude and ineffective in concept and execution. Like the others, Poggio, Bergetto's foil, mouths the importance of vows ("She hath in a manner promised you already"). (III.i. 9) Heartened by his assurance, Bergetto attempts to marry Philotis in defiance of Donado, the guardian. (III.i) Like the others, he chooses a secret marriage by slipping into the friar's cell during

the night (III.vii). The meaning of the Bergetto-Philotis union seems to show the real nature of all the other unions. Being an "innocent," Bergetto is the object of everybody's pity and contempt. Yet, he alone shows more honesty about his desire. For Bergetto, marriage is a physical and immediate satisfaction of desire. From the anti-Petrarchan description of Annabella's beauty (I.iii) to the unabashed admission of his lust for Philotis (III.i), most of Bergetto's utterances are vulgar, as Donado's exclamations attest ("Oh, gross," "This is intolerable" I.iii. 65, 71). But, this very vulgarity reveals the degree of deception that the others exercise under the dissimulation of the vows and marriage ceremonies.

The lovers' handling of the betrothal and marriage ceremony does not figure as a natural extension of their harmonious affection. On the contrary, it works ironically as an emblem of the actual gap between their spiritual idea of love and their physical execution of it. Although the lovers take the ceremony as binding their affection, they are consistently guilty of confusing lust with affection. Their performance of the ceremony is merely a facade of truth, a replica of the reality of the affection they wish to see. We are prepared, in witnessing these scenes, to accept the incongruity of the ceremony gone awry in the service of egoistic human lust. All the meaning and

relevance of such a ceremony are incongruously drained off and put to work in the cause of an unceasing lust. By being mishandled and misunderstood by the lovers, the ceremony is restrictive. More ironically, the ceremonial performance becomes a visible sign of their mental confinement and spiritual license. Because they fail either to recognize or to comprehend the discrepancy between protestation and act, the lovers create their own waste land as they allow their lust to pervert the ceremonial ideal.

Implicit in the perversion of the ceremony are the more crucial tragic effects which convey the lovers' emotional fact. The perversion becomes a dramatic proof for egoistic expediency and passion, and also suggests the different degrees of control that the lovers have over each other. The resultant tragedy is that their arrogation and exercise of power, in effect, create a circumscribing, imprisoning, private domain where their secrets and offenses must be locked away--not to be betrayed. Furthermore, their ceremonial perversion causes a dramatic process of growing uncertainty of purpose and a decreasing knowledge of their preceremonial motives, especially when their first motives are revealed in public actions. At the moment of their public self-revelations, we see two facts. One fact is that their initial, self-deluding emotions are uncorrected, and the other is that their actions have led them to

negate whatever stability of character or purpose they once possessed.

### 3. The Image of the Heart.

As mediatory and contributive to this effect of concealment and revelation, Ford uses the image of the heart, and its interchangeable multiple imagery of the soul, mind, bosom, and breast. As complementary and physical projections of the heart, Ford also uses bowl, box, cell, house, chamber, doors, gate, letter, poem, and sword. From the material and metaphoric vantage points from which he views it, the image of the heart may be seen as a symbol of the entire play. It becomes a vehicle conveying simultaneously the illusion and impotence of the passion's power and the resultant captivity by the heart.<sup>6</sup> In not fully understanding the nature of their hearts, the characters expose their innermost beings. Thus, they betray the absence or confusion of their self-awareness. In connection with the ceremonial perversion, the image of the heart becomes a dramatic and poetic metaphor of sovereignty which culminates in the ironic idea of "grace."

---

<sup>6</sup>An analogous view is expressed by D. K. Anderson in "The Heart and the Banquet: Imagery of Ford's 'Tis Pity She's a Whore and The Broken Heart," Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 2 (1962): 209-217. While I entirely agree with his premise that "the heart tells the story of Giovanni and Annabella," (p. 209) I have reached the similar conclusion from entirely different avenues.

The heart as a potential base for sovereignty is introduced by Giovanni. (I.i) As he belabors his theory of love to the friar, his heart's instinct is converted into something finer, and provides Annabella and himself with an ostensible autonomy for their incestuous act. He covertly rephrases the heart's instinct into the worship of the super-cosmic beauty of Annabella. Underlying his verbal conversion is the lustful instinct made over in the image of the Neoplatonic romantic heart. Thus, Giovanni's plea to the friar is based on their being "One soul, one flesh, one love, one heart, one all." (I.i. 34) His heart sanctions his passion. Later, as he seduces Annabella, he embellishes his metaphor: "Wise nature . . . meant/ To make you mine," or she would not have given them "a double soul." (I.ii. 242-4) The natural equality of the "double soul," then, empowers him to see her as the embodiment of the heart, with a mystical "grace" possessed with infinite love:

Come Annabella: no more sister now,  
 But love, a name more gracious; do not blush,  
 Beauty's sweet wonder, but be proud to know  
 That yielding thou hast conquered, and inflamed  
 A heart whose tribute is thy brother's life.  
(II.i. 1-5)

As the other half of the "double soul," Giovanni sees himself as an equally divine being ("Kiss me: so; thus Jove on Leda's neck,/ And sucked divine ambrosia from her lips" II.



i. 16-7). He also sees himself as a "king" ("But hold myself in being king of thee" II.i. 19). Implicit in his imaging himself as a divinity and a king is the grace which he perceives to have acquired. Repeatedly Giovanni stresses the sovereignty of the heart as an excuse for the transgression of his conduct. According to his understanding of the Neoplatonic "double soul," Giovanni and Annabella are fated for the perfect union. (II.v. 15-7, 47-8, 67-9)

While Annabella's grace and his might give an aura of sanctity to their physical union, the tragic nature of Giovanni's idea of the heart's sovereignty lies in its short duration and lack of permanence. This is why once the carnal act is committed, her status slips from being a divinity to being a mere mortal ("she is quick" III.iii.8). At the same time, he also takes a downward slide, from being a "regent" (III.ii. 19) to being a jealous, accusing lover. (II.i, III.i, V.v)

This self-deluding nature of the heart's "grace" is more bluntly seen in the Soranzo-Hippolita relationship. As Giovanni initially views Annabella as being "gracious," Hippolita succumbed under Soranzo's grace:

Thine eyes did plead in tears, thy tongue in oaths,  
Such and so many, that a heart of steel  
Would have been wrought to pity, as was mine.  
(II.ii. 35-37)

Now his perjury vanquishes his sovereignty over her heart: ("And thou of grace" II.ii. 60). In turn, it is now Soranzo's fate to solicit Annabella's grace: "They [tears] plead to you for grace." (III.ii. 25)

The heart's "grace" then is man's egoistic passion for special favor and privilege that define and control the human relationships. When its efficacy disappears, the relationship also corrupts, and, thus it affords the lovers with an ostensibly acceptable motive for repairing honor and for exacting revenge. In this respect, Ford's most ironic idea of "grace" is the Cardinal. Fitting to his ecclesiastic position, he is addressed by the others as "his grace" and "your grace." His title should represent a man blessed with heaven's favor. By the act of providing "grace," the Cardinal should be able to heal and redeem man to God. Instead of being a divine representative to society, the Cardinal is the very essence of the heart's corruptive, illusory sovereignty. As his treatment of Grimaldi's crime will show, the Cardinal's "grace" is, in fact, a summary metaphor of the society.

As long as the heart retains "grace," the power of favor--like temporary sovereignty among lovers--it has its use. At the appropriate moment, it can make them "regent now." (III.ii. 19) However, as Ford develops it, the

heart becomes an emblem of the characters' spiritual autonomy. In its rapid shifting into multiple imagery, it also becomes a physical emblem of the vulnerable, enclosed recesses in which the base human passions and desires (such as the social taboo of incest) must be materially and metaphorically hidden and locked up. The heart literally becomes a "prison" at once confining and vulnerable. It curtails the characters' movements and stifles their spirits while subjecting them to self-created destruction and annihilation.

The heart as a concrete image of prison is presented, when Donado absurdly pictures Bergetto as a melancholy lover: ". . . would you could hear/ Sometimes what I see daily, sighs and tears,/ As if his breast were prison to his heart." (II.vi. 8-10) Underscored in the prison image is a place of confinement and oppression. This is the implied meaning, when Annabella describes Giovanni: "Alas, he beats his breast, and wipes his eyes/ Drowned all in tears, methinks I hear him sigh." (I.ii. 143-44)

More fatally, the heart is a vulnerable point which is subject to constant assaults and changes. Florio's house, which encloses Annabella's heart, becomes a brawling ground between Grimaldi and Vasques. (I.ii) Likewise, the Cardinal's heart is physically locked behind the "gate" of his "house" which the citizens of Parma attempt to break

open. (III.ix. 14, 33)

One of the various perversions to which the heart is prone is its ability to assume grace and to falsify ideas for its own sake. But, its vulnerability to change and attack makes it something which should be safeguarded with caution and cunning. Concealment, rather than revelation, of the heart's innermost thoughts seem often the better policy. If one is forced to reveal one's heart, it is preferable to do so in secrecy and privately. Giovanni goes to the friar in his "cell" for private counsels (I.i, II.v), and so does Annabella for confession (III.vi). At other times, the secrets of the heart take more subtle, dangerous modes. Grimaldi, who does not know how "To move affection," (II.iii. 40) resorts to "policy." Given the chance to "speak in private" with Richardetto, Grimaldi's heart takes the sinister form of a poisoned sword. (III.v) Soranzo's heart is first revealed in his out-Sannazared love poem (II.ii), so is Bergetto's in his absurd love letters. (II.iv) Once Soranzo is allowed to speak his heart to Annabella, it must be done privately. (III.ii)

In these scenes, the image of the heart takes on a disparity of meaning analogous to the emotional disparity displayed by the lovers in the ceremonial perversion. The above-noted ceremonial perversion as both liberation and confinement of the lovers' beings is paralleled by the

double image of the heart. Namely, the heart is a place at once potent and reachable, offering the lovers the hope of favor and freedom. At the same time, it actually restricts their movements and eventually leads them to their physical destruction. The heart image suggests that the lover's corruption begins within themselves. Most notably, Giovanni's Neoplatonic view of love and the heart is not Neoplatonic at all; rather, it is Burtonian "burning lust."<sup>7</sup> Thus, his refusal or inability to come to terms with his commission of incest (as manifested in his self-justifying image of the "double soul") is a striking instance of an ignorance of self as visually demonstrated in the heart image. As the play progresses, we see Giovanni's ignorance of self in his failure to acknowledge that his self-deluding greatness of the one half of the "double soul" might amount to anything less than "A life of pleasure" in "Elysium" (V.iii. 16); this even though his role as a lover is unquestioned and is an integral part of both his public and private identities. Giovanni's failure to acknowledge the limits of the heart's "grace" accruing either to the lover's role or to his own person becomes the avenue whereby he is led, through his diminishing views of Annabella, to commit the final flagrant act of violating Soranzo's and

---

<sup>7</sup>Quoted from Tudor edition of Anatomy, p. 655.

Annabella's hearts. (V.v, vi)

As for Soranzo, we find an analogous connection between his unwitting revelation of the heart through Vasques and his similarly unexamined dealings with Annabella and Hippolita. Soranzo's violent behavior in pursuit of Annabella through Vasques in Act I.ii, his violation of Hippolita's heart in Act II.ii, and his final act of vengeance on Hippolita, Annabella, and Giovanni--all these acts stand in marked contrast to those scenes in which his heart takes on the oppression of an uncertain lover (II.ii) or the passive bewilderment of a betrayed husband (III.ii). But this very disparity in his conduct serves to reveal his imperfect understanding of his own heart. Soranzo finally loses his heart in the barbaric blood-lust through Vasques' duty-bound policy, when fulfilling his obligation to avenge his "honor."

Giovanni and Soranzo, then, represent the already flawed human heart of the tragic world of this play. Because the characters possess flawed, corrupt hearts, they are well advised to hide their secrets deeply within the confines of their hearts. Paradoxically, because the hidden secrets are the life and sustenance of the characters' beings, the public exposure of their hearts means death, both physical and spiritual.

#### 4. The Ceremony of Revelation: A Pattern of Counter-Ceremonies.

It is from the coexistence and superimposition of the qualities of the human heart that a cluster of other ceremonial patterns of public revelation begins to emerge. They are Ford's ultimate, serious depictions of the tragic vision which is central to this play. Such patterns reveal the same ironic doubleness--the discrepancy between the heart's spirit and sovereignty and its vulnerability--which we see in all the characters' conducts.

Ford introduces this deadly impact of the exposed heart in the last half of Act I.ii, in what may be viewed as a tableau of wooing. The scene begins with Giovanni's somewhat oblique declaration of love to Annabella, who first takes it as a jest: "Oh, you are a trim youth." (212) But suddenly, the jest takes on a macabre spectacle of menacing reality as Giovanni draws a dagger and tells Annabella:

And here's my breast, strike home.  
 Rip up my bosom, there thou shalt behold  
 A heart in which is writ the truth I speak.  
 Why stand'ee?

(I.ii. 215-218)

By way of the spatial arrangement and opposition of the two antagonistic elements--dagger and the heart--Ford achieves, in a single moment, the compelling image of precisely that ironic fact about Giovanni, who at this early stage irrevocably commits himself to his heart's corruptive actions. As

the following exchange between them will show, their hearts are something that must not be revealed. Such a heart should remain imprisoned, for the consequence of its exposure would be death ("Giovanni: You must either love or I must die"; Annabella: Love me, or kill me" 235, 262). Not only does Giovanni's gesture of drawing a dagger decide their fate, but also it ominously presages their eventual deaths. The dagger, with which he threatens Annabella to ply open his "sick heart" (190), is not merely an instrument symbolizing physical power and violence; more importantly, it acts as a symptom of Giovanni's ignorance of his inner corruption. By deliberately courting love through violence, he, at this precise moment of extraordinarily physical and mental fervor, clearly displays his corruption. By liberating her "captive" heart, Annabella also acts contrary to her own misgivings. The resultant tragedy is that both Annabella and Giovanni are trapped in the confining, oppressive environment of the heart, but they are ignorant of such entrapment. Furthermore, the tableau foreshadows a widening gap between correct thought and action, which the other characters similarly display by exposing their secret hearts.

Ford's subsequent ceremonial patternings reinforce the tragic implications of the exposed heart in this tableau. For instance, we find in Donado a less horrifying



but equally corrupt heart. We see this as his heart image is being gradually exposed, when he over-manipulates Bergetto's simple heart. Donado attempts to improve Bergetto's suit to Annabella. But his every scheme--his attempt to lock up Bergetto, the letter and the jewel--is a material projection of the corruption which he, in good sense, should have hidden and ignored. In this context, then, his corrupt heart comes into focus in Act II.vi, which may be termed as a masque of policy, a policy which is eventually put down by its own deception. Fittingly, the masque is played out, as is the tableau of wooing, in the contrasting images of the heart, one wisely withdrawn and the other unwittingly betrayed. The scene begins with the image of Giovanni's heart confined and hidden away in the friar's cell. It is immediately followed by Donado's self-unaware revelation of his heart. For he, in handing out the love letter to Annabella, describes Bergetto as "prison to his heart," (10) an ironic echo of Annabella's "captive" heart in the tableau. By imitating a verbose style of amatory compliment, he makes a grotesque travesty of Bergetto's heart, and exposes his own deception. More suggestive of his corruption than his verbal deception is Donado's resorting to a more palpable policy. Sensing Annabella's withdrawal, he gladly takes Putana's ingratiating alliance and rewards her with money. Like the dagger, Donado's letter, jewel,

and money act as a brute force which threatens her with-drawn heart, as we see in her speech and unwillingness to accept the letter. The irony is that by exposing his heart and by thus forcing her to reveal her heart, Donado subjects himself to the revelation of his greedy heart. It is fitting, therefore, that his subsequent admission of deception is followed by the prompt appearance of Bergetto himself, who provides a further humiliating commentary on Donado's deception ("What, you have read my letter? Ah, there I - tickled you, i' faith" 65).

We steadily witness more devastating revelations of the exposed heart as the play progresses. In Act III.ii, which is the composite of a masque and a tableau, there is a dramatic double image of the heart spatially presented on the stage, with Soranzo and Annabella in full view at the center stage, symbolizing the exposed heart, and Giovanni hidden on the upper stage, symbolizing the secretive heart. The dramatic action centers in Soranzo's wooing Annabella. While this scene ironically recalls the courtship between Giovanni and Annabella, the immediate irony comes from those emotional contradictions which the exposed hearts of Soranzo and Annabella bring to light. Despite his protestation of tender love to her, the real nature of Soranzo's heart is not what it appears at this moment. His actions show his

heart as a crudely violent and expedient one. We saw this in his previous attempt, by means of Vasques' sword, to brawl near Florio's house and in his violation of Hippolita's heart. In wooing Annabella, then, Soranzo exposes his false heart which, to Annabella, is already "dead."

(24) Moreover, in courting Annabella's "grace" (27), he is immediately rendered vulnerable ("I'm sick, and sick to th' heart" 35). Similarly, Annabella is not the "gracious" goddess Giovanni sees in her. Instead, by mocking and equivocating Soranzo's suit, Annabella is a "proud" (II.i.3) and un-"gracious" (2) woman. The penalty of betrayal of such a heart is that she is equally rendered powerless ("Oh, oh, my head," "oh, I begin to sicken" 63, 65). The irony of such exposed hearts is greater than just their deception and vulnerability. Throughout this scene, the effect of irony deepens, arising from the contrapuntal interweavings of the concealed Giovanni's asides. Counterpoised as a hidden heart, Giovanni gives a further commentary on the exposed heart. As his asides describe Annabella, her image steadily diminishes and finally she is a mere "woman" who is "nimble" in answer and has "but a woman's note." (11, 32, 22) Soranzo's romantic gesture also appears in a ridiculous light, because, Giovanni being her "regent now," Annabella has no "grace" to give to

Soranzo ("One such another word would kill his hope" 29). More ironically still, Giovanni's concealment and asides throw a further light on his already flawed perception of his relationship with her. In his last aside, his previous protestation of love proves to be mundane suspicion and jealousy ("Why, now I see she loves me" 56).

The futility and the degeneration of the exposed heart are also revealed by the Cardinal's treatment of Grimaldi's crime at the ecclesiastic trial. (III.ix) The situation at this moment is that in collusion with Richardetto, Grimaldi has just murdered Bergetto by mistaking him for Soranzo. (III.vii) Realizing his blunder, he flees to the Cardinal for protection. Again, the scene begins with the image of the Cardinal's closed heart physically associated in the closed "gate" and the "house." Appropriately, Grimaldi hides himself behind that enclosure, and his action symbolizes the very act of hiding his own heart. The double irony of the ensuing scene soon becomes obvious, as the citizens of Parma attempt to "knock" open the closed up heart. Since they want the Cardinal's open heart, Florio urges Donado to "Spend not the time in tears, but seek for justice." (3) Richardetto chimes in: "The Cardinal is noble: he no doubt/ Will give true justice." (23-4) But once the Cardinal emerges from the "gate," we see the penalty in the citizens' attempt to expose the "grace" of

the Cardinal: he refuses to punish Grimaldi. Fittingly, the trial is carried out through the clash between the civic idea of "justice" and the ecclesiastic sense of "justice." The irony of the trial's outcome derives not so much from the Cardinal's partial execution of justice as from his acute awareness of the different states of men in society: Grimaldi is above common laws, because "He is no common man, but noble born;/ Of prince's blood." (57-8) In fact, he treats the citizens as "saucy mates" who haunt his residence as "your common inn" and he in turn dismisses their petition as "nor duty nor civility." (30, 33, 31) In this vein, he accuses Florio's presumption in refusing Grimaldi's suit to Annabella: "you, Sir Florio,/ Thought him too mean a husband for your daughter." (58-9)

The trial scene again reinforces this gap between what the heart promises and what it actually yields. In fact, Grimaldi's humble submission "to your grace" (51) rings hollow and makes an ironic comment on the citizens' action as well as on the Cardinal's heart. What the Cardinal's "grace" does is arbitrarily to subvert social justice ("Justice is fled to heaven and comes no nearer" 64) and to falsify God's "grace" ("heaven will judge them for't another day" 70). In view of his final words condemning incest and branding Annabella as a "whore" at the end of the play, the Cardinal's action here adds to the

heart's loss of vitality a dramatic proof of the world's unending condition of evil.

The trial scene is immediately followed by the revelation of Hippolita's heart as she tries to get revenge on Soranzo. The scene (IV.i) is an equally public occasion celebrating the marriage of Soranzo and Annabella, and takes the form of the masque of revenge, couched within the masque of celebration. As the masque of celebration unfolds, the appearance of benignity and delight implied in the marriage banquet soon becomes emblematic of the lurking threat of the malice and decay of the exposed heart. The scene, beginning with the friar's heart, gradually develops into more visible patterns of destruction. That the friar's heart is guilty is seen in his blessing of the false marriage: he knows that the marriage is not a sign of the high union with the divine. Together with his part in the concealment of Annabella's guilt, his words of blessing, especially his reference to divine beings, emphasize his culpable heart. Equally reprehensible and culpable is Soranzo's heart which is seen in his grateful responses to the friar's blessing. The masque of celebration is a mere expediency for Annabella, while for Soranzo it is proof of his heart's triumph over Grimaldi's nobility (I.ii, III.ix) and over Hippolita's "nobler . . . birth" and "spirit." (II.ii. 50, 42)

The fragility of his triumph is evident in the masque of revenge. We see the ironic poignancy of the masque in several ways. First, like Donado's masque of policy, Hippolita's masque puts down Soranzo's deception. Secondly, it embodies the kind of futility that the exposure of the heart means. Especially ironic is the gap between concealment and revelation which is symbolized in the dance. Her accourterments of the dance--face masks, white robes, garlands of willow--signify her devices of concealment, her private shame and resignation visibly cloaked. But, when she discloses her identity by ripping off her mask, she discloses not only the deception of such devices, but also her heart's inherent corruption. Like Giovanni's dagger in the tableau, her sartorial dissimulation only emphasizes the extent of her lust now converted into revenge; furthermore, it becomes the visible weapon with which she attempts to approach Soranzo's heart. Her unmasking, then, is but one step away from her forcing "treachery" on Soranzo.

The final irony of the masque is that the exposure of her heart yields nothing but her own destruction. Her guile recoils on herself when Vasques, whom she thought to be her ally, remains loyal to Soranzo. He gives her a cup of poisoned drink and reveals publicly her foul plans, including her promise of marriage to him. As her revenge is

born of her already tainted heart, her act of public revelation merely confirms such a heart. As she dies cursing Soranzo and his marriage to Annabella, she feels her own heart's "cruel, cruel flames." (95) This horrendous last image of dying Hippolita, engulfed in her self-created flames of lust and vengeance - an image which strikes us more awfully because of the benign background of celebration and her pure white costume - again works as a summary image of the human heart in this play. As a palpable dramatic image of Hippolita's exposed heart, the masque of revenge heightens her disintegration. It also recalls us back to the friar's prophetic words: "death waits on . . . lust." (I.i. 59)

In Act IV.iii, Ford sets off equally grim, painful moments in which we observe a number of tragic revelations. This scene can be viewed as the masque of honor, and "honor" is a concept with which the characters attempt to hide their ultimate degradation. The double image of the heart is carefully counterpointed in visual and verbal terms, as Soranzo's moral indignation turns into a whirlwind at the discovery of Annabella's deception. Soranzo enters "unbraced, and Annabella dragged in." His violent behavior is a kind of dramatic notation, serving as a hyperbolic, outward translation of their inwardly disorderly, degenerated hearts. Soranzo's heart is crystallized in "this sword"



(3) with which he threatens Annabella's confession of her lover. Her heart is, in his view, like that of "harlot" and "whore." (4, 1)

The action of the masque confirms what is implied in the heart image: their marriage, like other marriages in the play, is a blind, a covert screen behind which they convert lies and lusts into socially acceptable acts of honor and revenge. When Annabella refuses to reveal her lover's name, scorning Soranzo's pains, she displays the extent of her moral blindness. Once she told him that his heart was "dead" in her eyes (III.ii), and now, she admits that "'twas not for love/ I chose you, but for honor" (22-23) - her honor by which she means the preservation of her good name. She further admits that were she not "with child," (26) "I never had been troubled with a thought/ That you had been a creature." (47-8) Compared to Soranzo, Giovanni is infinitely superior, for he is "the man/ The more than man . . . So angel-like, so glorious, that a woman . . . would have kneeled to him, and have begged for love." (30, 37-9) To her, love and marriage are totally separate concerns. Because, in her scheme of values, love outweighs marriage, Soranzo should be content "To father what so brave a father got." (46)

Annabella's blind self-revelation is equally matched by Soranzo whose primary concern for honor is now betrayed.

His bitter anger stems from his discovery that the marriage has been a timely accommodation "to be cloak to your close tricks,/ Your belly-sports." (11-2) Now his honor--his self-image--is gravely injured ("Was there no man in Parma to be bawd/ To your loose cunning whoredom else but I?" 6-7). Together with Annabella's initial deception and her refusal to confess, her continuous taunts now goad him into self-redeeming physical acts of regaining favor and revenge. (55-8, 77) The echo of the tableau (I.ii) is unmistakable. Like Giovanni with his naked dagger poised over his heart, Soranzo, brandishing his sword over Annabella's heart, recreates the portentous image of death. But more importantly, like Giovanni "bewrayed" (V.v, vi), Soranzo's gesture presages Giovanni's catastrophic act: "These hands have from her bosom ripped this heart," as "honor doth love command." (V.vi. 61, V.v. 86)

As Giovanni's disastrous action will eventually turn out to be, Soranzo's idea of honor, colored by his delusions of innocence (his being the victim of incest and cuckoldry) and grandeur (his being the agent of avenging justice), produces nothing but an ironic revelation of his wasted desire and energy. His sword cannot possess what was not originally there in Annabella's heart. The cruel exchange between Soranzo and Annabella is a dramatic clue that their exposed hearts only exasperate and vitiate what

they deem honorable in their hidden hearts. It is in total accord with the masque's meaning that Soranzo order her to her "chamber," "to make no show/ Of alteration." (150, 146-7) To preserve his honor, he must "hide your shame." Literally and figuratively, the "chamber" is a place to hide both his and her tarnished honor.

In a rapid succession of highly visual, ceremonial scenes, Act V caps Ford's tragic patternings of the human heart. In this last act, Ford bears out his characters as "the heart's creatures" who have allowed their lives to be molded by the dictates of their hearts. It is entirely in keeping with the basically corrupt nature of their hearts that they reveal and expose them at this culminating, resolving public occasion. Because they were unable to understand their hearts properly, they are shown to be utterly incapable of comprehending their fates, fates resulting from their moral obtuseness. Their final grandiose gesture of revelation in the name of honor and revenge is final dramatic proof of their moral and emotional disintegration, as manifested in physical dissolution and annihilation.

Act V begins with a tableau of contrition, whose tragic impact issues from Annabella's withdrawn heart. As we know from the preceding scene, she is physically immured in her "chamber" by order of Soranzo, but her physical state is a symbolic representation of her heart--imprisoned and

isolated from the rest of the world. The symbolism gains strength when she enters "above" on the upper stage. This stage arrangement insists upon the distancing effect which her lament suggests. Unlike Soranzo and Giovanni in their final moments, she presents herself in a markedly different moral state. Her lament begins with the acknowledgment that her fate is her own creation, a consequence of the commission of "my lust." (1-10) Then she comes to the costly recognition that Giovanni is not what she believed him to be. In reality, he is neither a divinity nor a king "clothed with grace" (13) - a true grace of God. Comprehending her moral situation, she finally feels true contrition and acquires a perception of her new relationship with heaven. (25-9) Her fixed placement on the balcony is an emblematic notation of her removal and isolation, physically and morally, from Giovanni and Soranzo. Her spatial position on the stage also converts her personal recognition into a contemplation of general humanity. As she watches life from high above, humanity is the pile of wasting experiences, a spectacle to be watched from the prison of the heart (14-6). In this part of the tableau, Ford shows, for the first time, a persuasive case for the wisdom of the concealed heart. Just as Annabella proves her moral superiority here, the heart, if wisely handled, will lead humanity to true knowledge. As the heart is an

object susceptible to chaotic passions, it is better for us to hide it or to leave it imprisoned.<sup>8</sup>

Annabella undoubtedly shows integrity in her contrition and humility, but we are continuously forced to watch the pervasive futility of the heart's activity. The tableau's subsequent action bears this out. While she is lamenting, the friar appears "below." When he overhears her, he steps out and offers her his assistance to deliver to Giovanni "This paper double-lined with tears and blood."<sup>9</sup> (34) Like the image of "the chamber," the letter is another image of her heart. The double irony of their transaction lies first in her belief that the opportune appearance of the friar is a sign of Heaven's "favor," (45) allowing her to warn Giovanni of the imminent danger. But her action can also be viewed as another form of the revelation of her heart. By entrusting her letter to the

---

<sup>8</sup>The symbolic meaning of the heart seems similar to that of human passions in the previous plays. As human passions are perverse and chaotic, so is the human heart as the nurturer of such passions. This is why Ford seems to recommend the concealment of the heart, as he recommends harmony in The Lover's Melancholy and restraint and silence in The Broken Heart.

<sup>9</sup>This is a more devastating echo of Donado's masque of policy. As Donado's errand miscarries, the friar's mission equally accomplishes nothing in terms of saving Giovanni's soul.

friar, she at once undermines her newly acquired knowledge. Indeed, her entreaties--"bid him read it and repent," "bid him be wise" (47-51)--must, in fact, be directed to herself. In this respect, the tableau's ending, which is concluded with her grateful confidence in divine favor, adds to a persistent pessimism about the concealed heart which even her contrition and humility cannot entirely assuage.

This unrelieved pessimism is further seen in the ensuing tableau of Giovanni's defiance (V.iii). The image of the enclosed heart forcefully takes form in his Faust-like grandstanding of "two united hearts" (12) and Annabella's letter which the friar gives him. Again, he scornfully spurns the traditional moral dictates which condemn him, and proceeds to glorify "two united hearts like hers and mine." (12) His extravagant dismissal of the traditional morality and the marriage of Annabella is proof of his unreflecting, unrestrained involvement in the "double soul." His act reveals not only the actual impotence of the heart, but also the complete absence of his self-awareness. He is neither aware of the change taking place in himself (his initial noble love now converted into physical "pleasure" 7), nor is he aware that their "double soul" amounts to nothing but "a life of pleasure" in "Elysium." (16) This lust-defined closed heart continually reminds us of the real nature of his moral stature. As the friar,

entering the scene, aptly says, his heart, enmeshed in "my retired delights" and closed to "other worlds," is blind. (18, 13)

At this precise moment of exultation, Giovanni's heart is shown to be utterly degenerate and incapable of any coherent action that may lead him to redemption. Moreover, his defiant speech (31-40) is as excessive in tone as it is morally inauspicious. His perverse use of the heart image crystallizes in the image of "Death," and it increases a startling and deeply ironic inability to comprehend his ultimate fate as a consequence of his commission of incest. By discarding Annabella's warning and the friar's counsel, but by promising Vasques to "dare to come" to the "feast," (48, 43) he is on his way to self-created destruction. The final image of Giovanni's "soul" tottering "like a well-grown oak" (77) is impressive for its prophetic expression of his failure and the dissolution of which he is persistently unaware.

His moral and emotional impasse becomes fatally acute when Giovanni plays the traitor to Annabella's heart in Act V.v, and when he assumes moral victory and physical transcendence in exposing her heart in Act V.vi. The first scene is a tableau of the double soul, and it comments on the tragic extent to which Annabella and Giovanni have been, physically and spiritually, united. By way of their

physical closeness on the stage, Ford depicts the paradoxical distance that separates their souls. When he enters her chamber, he accuses her of "revolt," "malice," and "treachery" "To your past vows and oaths." (8, 10, 5) Ironically, his accusation of the change in her is persuasive proof of his own ignorance and underlines how far he himself has drifted from his original idea of Annabella. It is he, not Annabella, who has fallen from the self-assurance and the sense of privilege he had in the incestuous courtship. (11-14)

This disunity of their souls becomes increasingly painful in their exchange of dialogue. While Giovanni is fearful of their physical separation, fearful that she no longer belongs to him ("Hath your new sprightly lord/ Found out a trick in night-games more than we/ Could show in our simplicity?" 1-3), Annabella is trying to tell him that the separation will be more of a spiritual nature ("Be not deceived, my brother,/ This banquet is an harbinger of death/ To you and me; resolve yourself it is,/ And be prepared to welcome it" 26-9). This is her final attempt to keep their hearts hidden from the world, so that he alone will remain the guardian of their secret act. But, he misinterprets her warning. Realizing that they will be separated forever, he temporarily returns to his former myth-making self who envisioned the double soul. (29-41) His



vision of the world of transcendence ("this other world" 35) has a finer tone. By feeling uncertain of himself for the first time, Giovanni recognizes a possibility, out of their discordant experiences, that their relationship will be a unity of soul and body, proper balance and harmony between spiritual understanding of love and physical execution of it. There prevails a beauty, too, in his groping for the world beyond--through Annabella. And, in their uncertainties, they truly come together as a double soul, equal in "grace" and vulnerability.

His recognition is transitory and comes too late, and more fatally, the recognition does not extend to Giovanni's ultimate salvation. This we see in his immediate gesture of drawing Annabella to his heart - an image of his physical mastery, undercutting their spiritual closeness. At this point, he no longer believes in the quality of the double soul, but rather, in order to maintain his privilege (to be "regent") over her heart, he must possess it materially. Thus, he stabs unsuspecting Annabella to death, in the name of "revenge," "honor," and "love." This appalling image of Giovanni as possessor of her heart is an emblem which, in the very act of bloody acquisition, shows the sovereignty and the very perversion of that sovereignty. By fusing him as lover and murderer, the violated heart is a simultaneous expression of his awesome inner vitality and his moral

corruption. The image also completes the tableau's meaning that despite his acquisition of her heart, they have, in fact, completely drifted apart. Annabella's dying words ("Brother, unkind, unkind! - mercy, great heaven" 93) precisely point to the actual separation of their souls. Giovanni has "killed a love" (101) of Annabella, a fact of which he is totally unaware. It is with a telling image of his ignorance and degradation that the tableau concludes, with Giovanni still glorifying her heart and his final resolution:

Fair Annabella,  
 How over-glorious art thou in thy wounds,  
 Triumphant over infamy and hate!  
 Shrink not, courageous hand, stand up, my heart,  
 And boldly act my last and greater part.  
(V.v. 102-107)

To him, her death is martyrdom, a love's sacrifice, and it becomes "over-glorious" because the death was executed by none but his hands. His execution becomes the supreme mark of his love for her.

The play concludes with a tableau of self-declaration, and its meaning is further reinforced by the ecclesiastic trial. Appropriate for the moment of public revelation, the scene is set at a formal banquet to which all the dignitaries of Parma are invited. The meaning of the formal banquet is twofold: while it is a private stage for Giovanni's "last and greater part" and for Soranzo's revenge, it becomes a public event as well. More precisely,

it becomes the play's culminating, resolving public ceremony, that of the dispensation of hierarchic "grace."

Ford emphasizes the tragic nature of such public revelation. He concentrates on the degrading circumstances of Giovanni's and Soranzo's deaths, while focusing on their failure to understand their situations. Ford does this in large part by emphasizing the tragic nature of the social ambience. The most eloquent emblem of the social ambience is the presence of the Cardinal. The Cardinal's social rank is continually stressed, and when the banquet begins, Soranzo is most solicitous of the Cardinal's favor. What Soranzo's gesture communicates is the metaphorical double image of the heart ("grace"), revealing it as an environment that erratically affects human actions. As his treatment of Grimaldi's crime suggested, the Cardinal is the most damning objectification of the heart: it is at once powerful, open, oppressive, limiting, arbitrary and closed. The grace of the Cardinal's heart is illusory, while its dangers are neither fully understood nor believed in by the other characters. It is against this vitiated image of the heart that the disastrous revelations of the heart are to be enacted and judged.

Giovanni's appearance on the banquet scene, "with a heart upon his dagger," is a literal and symbolic tableau of self-declamation. The tragic irony of his final self-

deceiving declamation is enhanced by the iconographic grouping of figures in this scene: Giovanni's central position, focused in the gleaming dagger and "the reeking" heart (10), providing a sharp image of the revealed heart, against a background of the shocked hearts of society. Furthermore, his gesture adds to the tragic irony, because he invests his gesture with a ceremonial seriousness and solemnity.<sup>10</sup> He does this by carefully balancing his declamation with his frighteningly self-inflated speeches. By adopting an attitude of a victorious avenger of honor, Giovanni displays once more his absolute inability to understand his heart's nature. His perverse sense of moral victory centers in the fact that by materially possessing Annabella's heart, "fate or all the powers/ That guide the motions of immortal souls/ Could not prevent me." (12-4) In other words, by spoiling Soranzo's chance of revenge

---

<sup>10</sup> Giovanni here uses the heart image 12 times. It is no surprise to find this abundance of the image present in his futile attempt to defend his self-ignorance. In view of the unredeeming quality of his heart, I cannot help but wonder if Ford is obliquely commenting here, as elsewhere in the play, on the image of the heart as employed by Crashaw and the seventeenth century emblem books. In the devotional tradition, the heart is the source and fulcrum of man's salvation, while in this play the heart is the very source of man's physical and spiritual destruction. More specifically, Annabella's exposed heart overlaps the image projected by Crashaw's "The Flaming Heart," but unlike St. Teresa's, Annabella's heart does not speak God's "heau'n" to Giovanni.

("Soranzo: Shall I be forestalled?" 17), Giovanni thinks that he has recaptured his ultimate power over fate. Moreover, his triumph lies in his twisted idea that he and Annabella are at last free from any outside intervention and that they are finally one in his fantasy of the heart (" 'tis a heart,/ A heart, my lords, in which is mine entombed" 28-9). Finally, he is "a most glorious executioner" (35) of the arrogation and usurpation of the heart's sovereignty. Thus, he is able to justify his incestuous act. (45-49)

In visual and verbal terms, Giovanni depends for his very existence on his heart's energy, without realizing that his act is the very perversion of that energy. More fatally, he does not know that the more he reveals his heart, the more diminished and less redeeming his stature becomes. He is totally unaware that his very act of worshipping the heart only increases his stature as a damned man who knows no remorse nor humility. For instance, he is incredulous that the spectators cannot credit "These hands have from her bosom ripped this heart." (61) When Florio dies of a broken heart, he considers him a martyr for the cause of the heart, and includes him as a fitting member of his vision: "How well his death becomes him./ Why, this was done with courage." (67-8) Nor is he satisfied with the violation of the heart of "our house" (69),

for he includes Soranzo's heart without which his vision is incomplete: "Soranzo, see this heart, which was thy wife's;/ Thus I exchange it royally for thine." (75-7)

Ironically, Giovanni, himself mortally wounded, invests his death with a physical transcendence. Instead of comprehending his imminent death as a consequence of his prior act, he assumes martyrdom, and thanks Vasques for his part in speeding his death. (100-1) Then, he renounces mortality, insists that his eternal victory is his over death, and thus envisions "this other world" where he and Annabella will be again united:

Death, thou art a guest long looked for; I embrace  
Thee and thy wounds. Oh, my last minute comes.  
Where'er I go, let me enjoy this grace,  
Freely to view my Annabella's face.

(V.vi. 108-111)

His self-declamation finally amounts to his dying, last attempt to restore to himself "this grace" of the heart. The resultant effect is that his insistence on the heart's grace, colored by his delusions of innocence and grandeur, generates a tragic revelation of his egoism and fractured sensibility. This effect is in large part produced by Ford's superimposition of a foreground showing Giovanni destroyed in his self-created idealism, pointed on a background of the banquet, which culminates in the Cardinal's ruthless judgment and the pieties of Richardetto and

Vasques. His public revelation, in the name of "honor," "love," and "revenge," does nothing to save him nor Annabella. Instead, he is condemned as an "incestuous villain" and an "Inhuman scorn of men." (53, 71) His ceremonialized usurpation of the banquet only underscores the boorishness of his personality, as well as the self-deluded, self-glorifying nature of his heart.

We see in Soranzo's end a similar damning implication. Like Giovanni, he welcomes death. Moreover, he is pleased that "I have lived/ To see my wrongs revenged on that black devil." (91-2) Namely, he believes that by public exposure, he has repaired his public honor. There is no recognition in him that his own corrupt heart was the primary agent which caused him to lose his own way. It is fitting, therefore, that Soranzo dies on Vasques' bosom, a bosom which has been his counterpart.

The final note of tragic irony comes from the concluding trial scene in which the Cardinal dominates. Such a ceremonial conclusion seems appropriate to a dramatic world in which the characters are defined by the degree to which they commit themselves to the heart's "grace." Thus, the Cardinal's conduct supports a major assumption of this play that any involvement in the heart means involvement in limiting, corrupting, or dangerous activities of life. In addition to the deaths of Giovanni and Soranzo, the ever

present Cardinal, first as a spectator of their deaths and then as the executor of the "grace," accentuates the irreplaceable loss of regenerative power from the human heart. His swift but erratic justice on Putana and Vasques and his immediate confiscation of properties only intensify our perception of what the revelation of the heart means. The Cardinal's judgment reveals his flawed heart. The deadly impact of such revelation is that the Cardinal's heart is taken to be the norm of the society. He is the final representation of society and of its unending condition. The Cardinal's last judgment of Annabella stigmatizing her as "a whore" (64) is a censure not of her, but of him and the society as a whole which is willing to take back Richardetto who has successfully hidden his heart.

It is with a disconcerting sense of human effort and desire that Ford closes his tragedy. Ultimately this sense comes not from the fact that the lovers' deaths are meaningless, since they seem to accept punishment without quibble. It rather comes from the fact that their very acceptance of the punishment seems to mark the degree to which their character has been shaped by their hearts alone. Ford's characters in this play are an embodiment only of the heart's activities and are divorced from man's ideal ethical nature. Subjected to the demands of the heart, their conduct does not convey the sense of the growth of



new consciousness; it is rather comprised of a series of revelations of their chaotic passions and inclinations.

If any theory is discernible from Ford's ironic use of tragic materials, could it be that he is parodying the traditional form of tragedy? And, by an ironic parody of that form, is he implying the impossibility of coherent order and structure in human experiences? By assuming this, I can return to Doran's basic objection to this play and turn it around to suggest that the apparent structural disconnection is intentional on Ford's part. The episodic nature of the structure is closely related to the theme which emphasizes the consistently fragmented and disorderly human conduct in this play. With his pessimistic view of the human heart, Ford cannot allow his characters, placed as they are in the generally melancholy condition, to gain any sort of integration of personality or vision. Ford's use of ceremonial forms, then, has a particular kind of function to present confusion, self-contradiction, and malaise in human nature and conduct. Because the ceremonies are as mannered and formalized as possible, the characters' unconscious adoption of a ceremonial mode becomes, all the more, an acid and ironic comment on themselves.

## CHAPTER VII

### LOVE'S SACRIFICE

#### 1. The Definition of Two Ceremonial Threads.

Consistent with his perennial interest in betrothal and marriage, Ford again presents in Love's Sacrifice the meaning of love as it appears in the dramatic conflict. We must question, however, what new aspect of love Ford is attempting to consider in this play. A part of the answer to our question seems to lie in the structure, especially in Ford's use of multiple plots. In the foreground, there is a precarious, romantic love affair involving Bianca, the Duke and Fernando; whereas the background draws in the other less romantic characters concerning their participation in the Pavian court. And, the structural crux of the play rests on how one welds together the interaction between the two groups of characters and situation. If we concentrate on the structure, then we seem to be able to conclude that Love's Sacrifice is Ford's continuous rendering of the emotion of love, here conceived and embodied

within his acute time-sense. Indeed, it is his time-sense that forms a dramatic, ethical and emotional core to the main and subplots. Not only is the play about the conflict centering in the passion of love as it appears in the dramatic action, but it also develops a sense of conflict coordinately in a span of time which is recognizable to the spectator. From Ferentes' sardonic scorn of time's workings to the Duke's consciousness of the melancholy human condition, Ford depicts a wide range of human awareness of the passing of time.<sup>1</sup> More particularly, he makes the emotional

---

<sup>1</sup>What I wish to develop in this chapter--the connection among the constant affection, self-identity, and the time-sense--is supportable in the argument of the dedication. By acting as a presenter of dedication (by itself a ceremonial gesture of homage and tribute), Ford seems to suggest that only in this form, "this witness to posterity of my constancy" will be committed to the lasting memory of time. In the play, this unity of form and love is repeatedly stressed. With this premise, I would argue that Ford with his celebration of constant affection as a moral form of immortality and his elevation of sacrifice as a memorializing performance, develops the time sense coordinately with the dramatic action.

The lines quoted in this analysis are from the edition of Havelock Ellis, John Ford, Three Plays (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957). Ellis' edition does not include line divisions, and, therefore, for the line divisions, I have used the edition of W. Bang in John Fordes Dramatische Werke, volume 23, reprint (Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1963).

conflict and situation the basis for defining the characters' ideas of love as related to their sense of self in time. It is my purpose in this chapter to explore the meaning of love, and how it leads me to what is perhaps the ultimate issue: the relation between man's sense of self and his sense of time. I should like to suggest that this thematic concern is structurally realized and communicated in a number of ceremonial forms. I also suggest that the ceremonies in this play are a sort of eternalizing conceit--the moral artifice in performance--conveying the characters' responses and answers to time's working.

From this thematic perspective of time I will define the ceremonial forms employed in this play. Typical of Ford's strategy, two threads of ceremony are observable. One thread is the formal convention of the marriage vows and rites. It provides us with the basic pattern of emotional complication involving the Duke, Bianca, Fernando, Roseilli, Fiormonda, Ferentes, Julia, Colona, Morona and Mauruccio. What connects these characters is their attitude to the emotion of love which is the foundation and the expression for the formal convention of the marriage vows and rites. Although the performance of the formal convention is ideally and traditionally construed as a symbolic culmination of the perfect accord of the lovers' affection, the ceremony of the marriage vows and rites becomes in this play an occasion in

which they are forced to examine their ideas of perfect love, and their examination of love, in turn, leads them to define themselves in terms of the private view of self and the public image of self. It is not the actual guilt or innocence of Bianca, Fernando and the Duke that is the subject of the play. Rather, its subject is what one learns about the values from their triangular relationship. What is the true nature of love, and its relationship to the institution of marriage, and with it, social rank and code of justice, and in general, to the world of the outward persona? The performance of the formal convention of marriage affords the lovers a chance to see themselves as creatures driven by love. It also defines them as "split" selves--the private self dominated by true love, and the public image of self which their social duties and obligations entail. The formal convention of the marriage vows and rites is ideally intended to establish a stable self in firmly traditional terms (such as the status of ruler, wife, husband). The play concludes that love is something that must be defined by a more private ethic of constancy--a moral form of immutability--as climaxed by sacrificial acts of Fernando, Bianca and the Duke. Constancy to true feeling is important according to the lovers in this play, because their world lacks permanence, although it presents a misleading appearance of permanence which the marriage

ceremony and vows seem to support. As a result, who will succeed and who will fail in his individual wishes is determined by the stability of love and self-identity gained. The more the stability of love can be preserved in a lover's handling of the formal convention, the more lasting his passion becomes, and by extension, the more he recognizes his true identity.

But this emotional treatment of the marriage vows and rites, which I shall call the ceremony of constancy, is transformed into a more general, philosophic consideration of man's relation of his identity to time's workings. This ceremonial structure, which I shall call the ceremony in performance, stresses the universality of man's time-encumbered self. Such self manifests itself in the curiously theatrical and gloomily discontinuous quality of human love. Moreover, this ceremonial pattern shows the characters who engage in a continual effort to achieve permanence of identity--a unity of the private self and the public image--by entry into the world of performance.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>In terms of the characters' role assumption and performance, this play looks forward to Perkin Warbeck in which the question of identity is treated in a more complex way.

Consisting of a series of ritualized actions, this ceremonial thread is one in which the characters define their permanent sense of self within the melancholy time-bound condition. They attempt to take unto themselves the stability of love and identity in ritualized acting. By combining the ceremonies of constancy and the ceremonies in performance, Ford is able to present a dilemma in the human situation--one in which man is time-circumscribed and yet he must constantly aspire to reach out for some forms of transcendence.

2. The Ceremony of Constancy: Traditional Marriage and the Marriage of Personal Preference.

In the world of Love's Sacrifice, the lovers' ideas of marriage are determined not by their sense of public obligations and the awareness of the social image of self, but by private inclinations. Ford opposes the traditional marriage, represented by the traditionalists in the Pavian court, such as Petruchio, to the self-sufficient individualism--the Duke's romanticism and Fernando's (and to the lesser degree, Roseilli's) stoicism on one hand, and Ferentes' hedonism and Mauruccio's Petrarchanism on the other. From the moment when Petruchio, the tradition-minded adviser to the Duke, complains of "such blind matches" (I.i.196) the practice of marriage based on personal preference is in evidence. The Duke, Fernando, Ferentes, and Mauruccio

alike assume sufficiency of one's identity from "affection" and the Pavian court contains a train of the lovers whose views of affection and of the sense of self reflect an individualistic ideal of marriage. However, the movement of the play's action forces a reassessment of this ideal, confronting the lovers with the fact that it contains contradictions. In the end, the lovers must choose between the willful view of affection of the Duke and the stoical constancy of Fernando. In posing this choice, Ford makes Ferentes and Mauruccio the measure of comparison.

The existence of a disjunction between the traditional form of marriage and its individualistic practice becomes immediately apparent in Caraffa's court, since the form is established according to the personal preference and will of a duke whose rule depends less on "profit" (i.e. policy and convention) than on "affects" (i.e. love and inclination). (I.i. 277, 273) To an old counsellor like Petruchio, the Duke's marriage to the socially inferior Bianca is the crowning breach of conduct in the inherited social status of a ruler whose submission to the emotion of love over form ("counsel" 200) is proof of the Duke's romantic will and preference (I.i. 176-200)

A less willful but similarly romantic view of marriage is upheld by Fernando who tells Petruchio that "If, when I should choose, Beauty and virtue were the fee pro-



posed,/ I should not pass for parentage." (I.i.204-6) Unlike Petruchio who adheres to the traditional marriage based on social rank, status and policy, both the Duke and Fernando disregard it, by comparing their personal affection and will with an ideal value. In the immediately succeeding scene, the idealization of affection becomes even more apparent as the Duke and his retinue enter. In proclaiming Bianca and Fernando as "a perfect friend, and a wife above compare," (219) the Duke carries his romanticism to idealistic lengths. He argues that Bianca's beauty and Fernando's loyalty make him "a monarch of felicity." (219) It is by an appeal to his "affects," not to "profit," that the Duke justifies his royal match to Bianca whose lineage his counsellors cavilled at (I.i.271-84).

Initially, then, the Duke defines himself as a new kind of ruler who matches his real affection to the benefit of his realm. His acute sense of the public self ("the privilege of blood," "a tribe of princes" 227, 275) does not contradict "the name of husband," (231) his private self. Moreover, his romantic view of affection allows him to invoke an idealistic belief in the union of true souls when he suggests that Bianca should treat Fernando just as he does him: "only the name of husband,/ and reverent observance of our bed,/ Should differ us in person, else in soul/ We are all one." (231-34) Because he is confident in

his romantic view of affection, the Duke is at once a ruler, a husband, and a friend.

But, the simultaneous assumption of one's being the public self and the private self is not easily maintained. Hint of this difficulty is suggested in two ways in the same scene. Although Fernando publicly proclaims himself to "hold a correspondency in friendship" (222) and remain "the style of servant" (225) to the Duke, this public gesture is performed at the expense of disguising his real emotion. For, even before he is formally introduced to her, Fernando, who is already attracted to her, must rebuke his private preference for Bianca ("If ever, now,/ Good angel of my soul, protect my truth" 208-9). In a related way, the gulf between the public self and the private self is suggested when the Duke remonstrates with the widowed Fiormonda for remaining silent in his presence. Mistaking her silence as a sign of her adherence to the memory of her dead husband, the Duke advises her that "'tis a sin against/ The state of princes to exceed a mean/ In mourning for the dead." (248-50) To this Fiormonda replies with a subtle irony, arguing for the importance of affection by setting up a hypothetical situation:

Should form, my lord,  
 Prevail above affection? no, it cannot.  
 You have yourself here a right noble duchess,  
 Virtuous at least; and should your grace now pay -  
 Which Heaven forbid! - the debt you owe to nature,  
 I dare presume she'd not so soon forget  
 A prince that thus advanced her. (I.i. 251-257)<sup>3</sup>

It is significant to note that throughout the speech she stresses the public identities of Bianca and the Duke by addressing them with their respective public titles. Her parenthetical description of Bianca, "Virtuous at least," indicates that the Duke's choice of Bianca is no more than a disregard of his position and a gloss for his own indulgence of his preference and will. Fiormonda turns the rebuke on her behavior to the Duke's own conduct, and thus she introduces yet another case against the Duke's easy assumption of his own identity.

This scene, then, contrasts the traditional idea of the marriage ceremony to the individualistic practice of it by the Duke. It also suggests how inseparably his idea of marriage and one's sense of self are related. As the main action will show, the Duke's marriage to Bianca neither establishes their permanent public images as duke and duch-

---

<sup>3</sup>Italics mine. The opposition of "form" and "affects" is used throughout this chapter as part of analogous opposites (such as "profit" and "affection," and "name" and "love") and it distinguishes the public image of self based on rank and status from one's private true sense of self based on emotional truth and integrity.

ess, private selves as husband and wife, nor allows them to maintain those images. Rather, it offers an occasion in which the Duke, Fernando and Bianca become aware of the contradictory demands of form and affection, of the public self and the private self. Their ensuing tragedy is, therefore, created not only because Fernando and Bianca choose to affirm themselves by constancy, not to form, but to affection, but also because the Duke's earlier sense of identity is shaken by their apparent desertion.

The problem of identity is one which haunts Fernando most acutely. In his soliloquy, he is torn between his friendship for the Duke and his affection for Bianca. In a paradoxical expression of self-division, he anguishes over his muddled identity:

Traitor to friendship, whither shall I run,  
That, lost to reason, cannot sway the float  
Of the unruly faction in my blood?  
The duchess, O, the duchess! in her smiles  
Are all my joys abstracted. - Death to my thoughts.  
(I.i.449-453)

The catalyst which releases Fernando's emotional paralysis is Fiormonda who, having conceived a violent passion for him, makes advances both directly and through her flunky, D'Avolos. She is the means by which Fernando is brought to a clearer understanding of himself and to his final ethical choice to assert his love for Bianca. To Fernando, she is merely "my other plague," but her bold courtship forces

him to reveal to her his avowal "to live a single life."

(I.ii.454, 544) It is quite a stoical decision by which he attempts to maintain the state of equity between his loyalty to the Duke and his inclination to Bianca. And, it cannot last. Despite his heroical stance, Fernando becomes more attracted to Bianca. His second soliloquy indicates the degree to which his sense of self has shifted from a concern with loyalty to the Duke to loyalty to his own feelings:

Thus bodies walk unsouled! mine eyes but follow  
My heart entombed in yonder goodly shrine:  
Life without her is but death's subtle snares,  
And I am but a coffin to my cares. (I.ii.671-674)

This introspection is far removed from Fernando's public protestation to the Duke that "My uttermost ambition is to climb/ To those deserts may give the style of servant."

(I.i.224-5) It rather brings him one step closer to his final vision of himself as a victor in the matter of the heart. (V.iii)

As Fernando illuminates his emotional state in his soliloquy, love is life and its denial or betrayal is death. This is why Fernando dares to confess his love to Bianca.

(II.i) Though she acknowledges that "it once/ Thought goodness dwelt in you," (826-7) Bianca rebukes him. She reminds him of who he should be, not of what he desires to be. (828-32) Fernando must continue to be a subject and a friend to the Duke, not a slave to "lust." (832) At the

same time, her rebuke is an assertion of her public persona--the wife of the Duke and the duchess of the realm ("your treacherous tongue/ Hath pledged treason to my ear and fame" 828-9). Thus remonstrated, Fernando again reaffirms that he will remain stoical: "I must resolve to check this rage of blood,/ And will." (840-1)

Future tragedy could be averted if Fernando really heeded Bianca's counsel and thus remained faithful to his resolution, and if Fiormonda did not interfere. But, Fernando does not. Bianca's assertion of the public persona of the duchess only compels him to question what is her private person:

She is the duchess; say she be; a creature  
Sewed-up in painted cloth might so be styled;  
That's but a name: she's married too; she is,  
And therefore better might distinguish love;  
She's young and fair; why, madam, that's the bait  
Invites me more to hope: she's the duke's wife;  
Who knows not this? - she's bosomed to my friend;  
(II.ii. 860-866)

For Fernando, his view of her identity is a result of removing her public title. Being a "duchess" is "but a name", an outward sign. What matters is her being "young and fair," at least to him. The obstacle to his reflection is her married status, but he decides to ignore it. What matters is his private claim to her private person, and not to her public persona. Indeed, at this point, Fernando's private urge does look like lust and is treasonable. In

fact, he is not far removed from the willful Duke who pursued Bianca "As he pursued the deer." (I.i. 198) To compound his "Eternal mischief," (869) D'Avolos' temptation does not help him hold on to his flagging resolution.

(II.ii) It is with this confused vision of himself and Bianca that Fernando pleads his suit once more. (II.iii) But, she rebukes him in even stronger terms than before. (1205-19) The basic content of her speech differs little from the first, but, what is meaningful is the manner in which she rebukes him. Throughout, she represents herself as the royal "we," unmistakably recalling Fernando to her public persona, and he is addressed from the personal "you" to "thou" (a pronoun used to address an inferior, in contempt or reproach, O.E.D.). In this manner, she places him in his proper social place. With the tactful verbal stratagems of the true court manner, Bianca successfully imposes on Fernando their socially determined status and maintains it. Fernando receives the message correctly ("You've schooled me" 1225). Although he cannot overcome his passion, he vows never to speak it again and seals his avowal by kissing her hand, the ceremony of promise.

The establishment of this new formal relationship, then, indicates that the rationale governing Fernando originates in his stoicism. He decides to resolve the problem of his identity by remaining loyal to the Duke, without

destroying his constancy to the personal preference. By stoically refraining from urging his suit to Bianca, and yet also by retaining his integrity of love for her, he believes that he has reached a new understanding of himself. For Fernando to be truly himself, it is as much vital to remain loyal to the Duke and the duchess as to himself.

However, his realization has come too late, for declaring his love for Bianca, he has begun "to stir-up tragedies as black as brave," according to Fiormonda. (II.iii. 1266) It is the same problem of identity and rationale that prompts Bianca to offer herself to Fernando. Her pleading to him illustrates the dilemma of a person trapped between form and affection:

When first Caraffa, Pavy's duke, my lord,  
Saw me, he loved me; and without respect  
Of dower took me to his bed and bosom;  
Advanced me to the titles I possess,  
Not moved by counsel or removed by greatness;  
Which to requite, betwixt my soul and Heaven  
I vowed a vow to live a constant wife:  
I have done so; nor was there in the world  
A man created could have broke that truth  
For all the glories of the earth but thou,  
But thou, Fernando! Do I love thee now?

(II.iv. 1313-1323)

Like Fernando who pledged friendship to the Duke, Bianca, by the force of her marriage vow, has "vowed to live a constant wife." But, now she comes to a different understanding of "constancy." It is a constancy based on the recognition that, though the marriage to the Duke may define



her "titles," it cannot define her "truth"; though Caraffa may be "Pavy's duke, my lord," "in my heart/ You have been only king." (1296-97) Her view of constancy is further elaborated, when she threatens self-destruction. It is not through physical fulfillment but by an appeal to her real emotion that constancy must be defined: "No, by the faith I owe my bridal vows!/ But ever hold thee much, much dearer far/ Than all my joys on earth, by this chaste kiss." (II.iv. 1362-64)

Fernando in turn sees his stoicism mirrored in her declaration. When he says "you'll please to call me servant," Fernando and Bianca have now forged a new sense of self. This sense of self is to be decided not by formal obligations entailed in the marriage vows, but by something more personal--the strength of which lies in the enduring affection. Moreover, the integrity of their mutual sense of self is confirmed in Bianca's echo of Fernando's earlier affirmation: "When I am dead, rip up my heart, and read/ With constant eyes, what my tongue defines,/ Fernando's name carved out in bloody lines." (II.iii. 1381-84) She and Fernando here are cast by Ford as a symbol both of the force of emotional constancy by which man must eventually live and of the conflict between the demands of this force and those of the social order as suggested in the marriage vow. Their mutual attraction is the natural development of

the relationship of stoically romantic man and woman without the restraints of marriage. Such a marriage, symbolized by the union of the Duke and Bianca, can evoke no real feeling in Bianca, other than respect and gratitude.

Parallel with their emotional transformation, the Duke, too, is driven to question his willful view of "affects." He feels his identity threatened when the adultery of Bianca and Fernando--his other selves ("thou half myself," "My but divided self, else in soul/ We are all one") (I.i. 215, 233-4)--force in him a division between the demands of personal affection and public form ("honours"). His earlier sense of self is shaken first by D'Avolos' intimation of adultery. His immediate response is concerned with his public persona ("had my dukedom's whole inheritance/ Been rent, my honours levelled in the dust"). (1780-81) Thus, he destroys his initial confidence in Fernando and Bianca ("she, that wicked woman," "he, that villain, viper to my heart"). (1782, 1784) And, in so reacting, he betrays a division between his royal persona and his private self. To his credit, the Duke does not leap to conclusions; instead, he cautions D'Avolos to "Take heed you prove this true," to "See that you make it good." (III.iii. 1787, 1793)

It is the Duke's apparent inaction to repair his public image which goads Fiormonda to upbraid him. Initial-

ly, Fiormonda prefers "affection" to "form." With this personal philosophy, she has rejected the socially equal and truly affectionate Roseilli. Instead, she woos Fernando, and finding that Fernando "serves s in love the sister of my prince (I.ii. 487) (her public persona, not her private person), she forces her affection on him by breaking the vow made to her late husband. (I.ii) With D'Avolos' assistance, she later discovers the hopelessness of her courtship as well as the object of Fernando's real affection. This new knowledge, coupled with her wounded ego, recalls to her the code of social honor by whose rules a public person must live. The jealous frustration of Fiormonda vents itself by driving the Duke to defend his honor at whatever cost.

(IV.i. 1907-18) Knowing that the demands of society's code of honor dictate that the injured husband must seek retribution, she dwells on the extent of the public dishonor which the Duke's disbelief will incur. She scornfully calls his "most virtuous duchess," "your rare piece," (1926-7) and urges him to "Be a prince!" (1939) who is duty-bound to continue the legitimate line of secession. D'Avolos also emphasizes the bastard line of secession which will issue from the union of Fernando and Bianca. (1947-51) Their incessant allusions to the importance of the Duke's public persona finally rouses him from the indulgence of the romantic view of Fernando and Bianca to his vengeful definition

of what he is expected to perform. In proclaiming his public person, he vows that "you shall see Caraffa/ Equal his birth, and matchless in revenge." (IV.i. 1963-4)

The emotional conflict involving the Duke and Fernando, then, is not merely which of them will truly possess Bianca, but how Fernando can retain her affection and still win vengeance. Both the Duke and Fernando are moved by analogous emotions and by individualistic views of affection. Indeed, "affection" and its analogous terms are bandied about in the play. Moreover, the sufficiency of affection is the measure by which the Duke and Fernando allow themselves to claim their right to Bianca. But, as the above-noted observation is intended to show, the main action of the play gradually forces us to recognize a gap between the two individualistic views of affection. The first kind of affection is romantic and willful and it contains such public notions as duty and position as personified by the Duke. The second kind of affection is the stoical and idealistic position of Fernando, and it includes such private values as "truth" and "constancy" in love and loyalty. Thus, one's view of affection is closely tied with one's sense of self. The Duke's or Fernando's view of affection is one in which each comes to know his real self. What finally defines Fernando and Bianca is their claim to constancy of real affection, the constancy which they

themselves learn and the constant affection for which they sacrifice their lives. Their moral education is one in which they progress from mutual attraction to the true meaning of affection, their basis of being. It is the totality of their affection that is immortalized at the end. Similarly, the Duke undergoes a self-revision. His progress is one in which he transforms from a royal self to a person with real affection by virtue of which he is equally accorded immortality.

It is as a measure of comparison that Ferentes and Mauruccio become important. Their extreme views of themselves--Ferentes' hedonism and Mauruccio's Petrarchanism--place the Duke's and Fernando's views in relief, and their relationships with women throw a significant light on the question of identity as it is related to affection. First Petruchio depicts Ferentes as one "whose pride takes pride/ In nothing more than to delight his lust." (I.i. 177-78) Ironically, Ferentes tempts Colona "in my earnest affection," pledges constancy to Julia, and promises Morona "to love none but me, me, only me." (364-5, 428-29, 488) We later learn that Ferentes seduced the three women with the promise of marriage. By the terms of Ferentes' practice, his "affection" is a mask for "lust," his formal marriage vows are a convenience to gratify his hedonistic desires. He sees himself only "this slip of mortality" (I.ii. 398-9),

and his scorn of "chastity" is a blatant parody of the Duke's romantic "affects" and Fernando's stoic constancy and loyalty. His idea of himself ("I am an eunuch if I think there be any such thing," i.e. chastity) (436-7) is further clarified in the protestations by Colona, Julia and Morona whose naive trust in the institution of marriage recoils on themselves. On discovering Julia's affair with Ferentes, Nibrassa threatens to disown her, but Julia attempts to justify her conduct by resorting to the legitimacy of the marriage vow: "He has protested marriage, pledged his faith:/ If vows have any force, I am his wife." (1339-40) Similarly, Colona defends herself on the grounds of the binding nature of matrimony: "My fault/ Proceeds from lawful composition/ Of wedlock; he hath sealed his oath to mine/ To be my husband." (1426-29) Even Morona demands the fulfillment of his vow to marry her (sworest. . . to marry me the twelfth day of the month two months since." (III.i. 1489-90) Unlike Bianca, all three women want to define themselves according to the traditional marriage and the status of wife. It is the tradition and the status which accord them their "good name," (1487-88) their public images of themselves. But, Ferentes refuses to become a "betroted lord." (1514) Instead, they find themselves in the ignominious position of being "three Flanders mares." (1516) It is their acute sense of the injured social image

which awakens them from their "simplicities" to combined hatred, and induces them to "revenge/ Our public shame but by his public fall." (1873-74) Thus, they plot a public vindication in the course of a masque. (III.iv)

Judging from his conduct, Ferentes is a man who has disregarded both the ceremony of marriage and true love. Even at the moment of his death, he keeps to his true form of hedonism: "my forfeit was in my blood; and my life answered it." (III.iv. 1893) In contrast, Mauruccio is an example of a creature of form, but he is devoid of real affection. His absurd courtliness is but a grotesque travesty of true court manner and exemplifies a blunt and obvious misuse of form. He thinks that the strict observance of form will produce a desired self-definition by the conquest of Fiormonda in marriage ("as I pass, to walk a portly grace like a marquis, to which degree I am now a-climbing" II.i. 796). It is true that Mauruccio is a fool. But, just as Ferentes is used to expose the dangers beneath the romanticism of the Duke and Fernando, so Mauruccio gives a comic commentary on one's trust in form. He complements the Duke whose gradual assertion of the royal person and conjugal wrath signal the separation between the demands of the social order and the inadequacy of his personal preference. Both the Duke and Mauruccio try to improve on the tradition. As the Duke anticipates Bianca's real affection out of

the traditional form of marriage, so does Mauruccio from the strict observance of courtship, and his gift to Fiormonda--a dressing mirror in the form of a crystal heart--parodies the Duke's exultation of his soul. Perhaps it is a fitting end for a conformist like Mauruccio that he is finally dismissed from the court with the aging Morona. Nothing is more formally correct than the marriage ceremony which Fernando and Bianca perform with the sanction of the Duke. (IV.i)

By the terms of the lovers' experience of it, the traditional form of the marriage vows and ceremony is neither the culmination of their real affection, nor defines their real sense of selves. As Ford adopts it in this play, it is as if the traditional form, for Fernando and Bianca and later for the Duke, were somehow inadequate to cope with one's true self. Moreover, as Bianca's final abnegation of "the iron laws of ceremony" implies (V.i. 2354), there is an unbridgeable gulf between the public self and its social form, marriage, on the one hand, and the realm of the private self defined by real affection, on the other:



Why shouldst thou not be mine? why should the laws,  
 The iron laws of ceremony, bar  
 Mutual embraces? what's a vow? a vow?  
 Can there be sin in unity? could I  
 As well dispense with conscience as renounce  
 The outside of my titles, the poor style  
 Of duchess, I had rather change my life  
 With any waiting-woman in the land  
 To purchase one night's rest with thee, Fernando,  
 Than be Caraffa's spouse a thousand years.

(V.i. 2353-2362)

The initial individualistic conviction which the Duke pronounces by way of the truly affectionate bond in marriage indeed sounds harmonious with the idealistic public image of "princes":

No, my Bianca, thou'rt to me as dear  
 As if thy portion had been Europe's riches;  
 Since in thine eyes lies more than these are worth.

(I.i. 283-285)

If the Duke's conviction in the marriage of personal preference must conform to the traditional image of a public persona, then the values which he represents must equally conform to the judgment of his private feelings. But, before his belated performance of self-sacrifice following Fernando's, the Duke must learn the true meaning of "free affects" which Fernando and Bianca have proved by the constancy to their real feeling. In the public world, marriage may define and order who one is, but in the private realm of the individual lives, it is substituted by the ethic of constancy--the ethical basis of one's activity--which creates and preserves one's true and permanent identity.

Fernando and Bianca win the race with the Duke's vengeance; and they win because their sense of self and affection is more self-contained and, therefore, far removed from traditional titles and social positions. In the end, their claim to "posterity" (V.iii. 2873) derives not merely because they keep their ideal code of constancy, but also because they convincingly demonstrate it in the self-memorializing ceremonial acts of sacrifice. In Love's Sacrifice, constancy and its ceremonial performance combine to exercise a triumph over mortality and change, in a paradox that "should annul/ A testament enacted by the dead." (I.ii. 525-26)

### 3. The Framework of Time.

Examining the play with the question of identity embedded in the action, one is struck by Ford's treatment of time. Thematically, it is by the lovers' constancy to real affection that Ford defines the play's ethical time metaphor of immutability. But, there are other obvious allusions to time whose clearest expression is in the language. There is the peculiarly mixed time sense, the sense of a traversing along the past, present and future tenses. And, this continual cultivation of the sense of time leads one to see time in terms of the title's meaning, and in a way which justifies the play's climactic ending. In fact, the working out of the time metaphor forces one to consider love as a

guiding vehicle to the theme, a theme in which love, as the chief form of true self, also has the ideal function of preserving it for time. Moreover, their love and identity are preserved not only because Fernando and Bianca uphold an immutable constancy to affection, but because they prove it through the sacrificial act. Sacrifice thus has a special ceremonial meaning as the final monument to affection with which the characters are so much concerned. In the end, the play is not merely about the emotional conflicts in the Pavian court; it is about man's time-encumbered existence and about the relationship between man's conduct and time's workings.

Ford fills the action with the characters' acute consciousness of time, in order to tell the changing events as well as to clarify the "love" of the title. Ford first depicts the characters as time-controlling and time-controlled selves. In so doing, he implicitly contrasts the time-bound condition with the immutable "constancy to affection" which has the final self-defining effect. In the most real sense, daily events in the individual affairs and court business are thus defined in terms of the precise progression of time. Repeatedly, the personal and court events are described by the precision of a clock. D'Avolos' manner of conveying the Duke's order for Roseilli's dismissal from the court is typical of how time-conscious the Pavian court is:

he commands Roseilli "within five hours to depart after notice taken." (I.i. 84) Later on, the Duke, puzzled by Roseilli's non-attendance at court, but reminded by Fernando of his dismissal, explains his royal will by saying that "but we meant a day or two at most/ Should be his furthest term." (I.ii. 637-38) Equally time-conscious is Ferentes who keeps reminding the unfortunate Colona of a precise time of their assignation:

You will not fail to meet me two hours hence, sweet.  
In the grove; good sweet, remember; . . . you'll not  
forget? - two hours hence - think on't, and miss  
not: till then.

(I.ii. 383, 385-388)

Later on, we learn that Ferentes has promised to marry Morona "the twelfth day of the month two months since."  
(III.i. 1490)

Fernando is not impervious to time's passage, either. In order to set up a scheme of reconciliation between Fiormonda and Roseilli, he suggests Roseilli to present himself to court as a fool, and insists that "Without delay/ Prepare yourself, and meet at court anon,/ Some half-hour hence;and Cupid bless your joy." (II.ii. 853-55) In the meantime, Fiormonda schemes the downfall of Fernando and Bianca by appointing D'Avolos, to "observe to-night." (II.ii. 1107) Bianca beguiles the tedium of the Duke's absence by playing chess, but only for an hour: "'Tis yet but early night,

too soon to sleep . . . To pass an hour/ I'll try your skill, my lord." (II.iii. 1126, 1133)

Another important aspect of time is presented by changes which are inseparable from the characters' changing views of themselves. The most profound change is remarked upon by Petruchio in whose view the court of Pavia has degenerated into complete chaos through the corrupt influence on the Duke by men like Ferentes. (I.i. 172-74) Subsequently, we learn what self-image the Duke holds. As for Ferentes, he bluntly admits that time inevitably brings changes. His view is clear in his contemptuous view of honor--female sexual behavior--and its tendency to change and corrupt. His attitude toward female honor becomes his view of time. It in turn illuminates his hedonistic view of himself: "Time, like a turncoat, may order and disorder the outward fashions of our bodies, but shall never enforce a change in the constancy of my mind." (I.ii. 360-62)

While the characters are aware of changes taking place in their surroundings, their desire for change is suggested as a catalyst for new identities. When Roseilli discovers his fall from the court's favor, he intends to travel, so that "Perhaps the change of air may change in me." (I.i. 114) Fiormonda's consternation over Fernando's attachment to Bianca prompts in her a fierce determination to "change him, or confound him: prompt dissembler!"

(II.ii. 1072) Some characters use material changes.

Fernando changes Roseilli into a fool to find out the cause of his disgrace as well as to discover why Fiormonda has changed towards Roseilli. More simply, Morona suggests to Mauruccio that he put on "new change of apparel" so that they can start a new happy life together. (IV.i. 2113)

Closely connected with the characters' awareness of changes are their views of age or time of life. Throughout the play, there is a conflict between youth and age. Both Bianca's and Fernando's youth is preferred and upheld as suggesting permanence. In contrast, age is treated with frequent ridicule and contempt by the characters. For example, the Duke is amused at the old Mauruccio's attempt to "become a lover" and "the youth." (I.ii. 615, 617)

Later on, his ridicule of Mauruccio's "dotage" recoils on him, when Bianca confesses her preference for the young Fernando as opposed to the decrepit Duke. (V.i. 2436-40)

Equally ruinous is Ferentes' contempt for aged females. Besides his inconstancy, Ferentes' bawdy insult hurled at Morona's age clinches her decision to avenge her soiled honor. (III.i. 1495-98)

Whether metaphoric or literal, the characters' inordinate consciousness of time in those scenes clearly shows the unavoidable time-bound condition of man. In fact, these scenes may be seen as a reinterpretation of the melancholy

human situation introduced in The Lover's Melancholy. In Love's Sacrifice, however, the lovers' affection and their sense of self are not confirmed in the framework of the marriage ceremony nor in the immutable providential plan. They are rather affirmed by an entirely different value--constancy to one's real affection. In this time-bound Pavian court, then, constancy to affection has a special function. As the characters are aware of it, time may reduce affection to hatred and vengeance, as in the case of the Duke, Fiormonda, Colona, Julia and Morona. But, it cannot destroy the affection of those who learn the meaning of constancy. For Fernando and Bianca, constancy is their moral proof of indestructible affection; it is also an immutable preservative of their affection. It is by the performance of constancy that they allow themselves to defeat the destructive power of mutability.

Indeed, it is the meaning of immutable constancy that is reinforced in the characters' allusions to name, honor, posterity and monument. In the beginning of the play, when Roseilli receives the Duke's sudden order of his dismissal from the court, the first thought on his mind is his ancestral name:

You're secretary to the state and him,  
Great in his counsels, wise, and I think, honest.  
Have you, in turning over old records,  
Read but one name descended of the house  
Of Lesui in his loyalty remiss?

(I.i. 70-74)

Roseilli's question emphasizes the characters' awareness of indestructible being in the form of birth, ancestry and blood which traditionally insure the continuity of being. Roseilli's sentiment is echoed by Petruchio who disparages Bianca's birth ("She was daughter/ Unto a gentleman of Milan - no better -"). (I.i. 190-91) Petruchio suggests that lacking proper breeding, Bianca will not match the time-honored house of Caraffa.

Unlike Roseilli and Petruchio who seek to preserve their being via the traditional honor, Fernando and the Duke attempt to create a different standard--the Duke's romanticism on the one hand, and Fernando's stoicism on the other. In effect, their individualistic views of affection make them "a bosom partner," a kind of transcendental being. But, they must part company when Fernando forms an altogether different pact of affection with Bianca. Conversely, the Duke is forced to condemn them according to the traditional code of honor. The tragedy of the Duke lies in the fact that the alleged adultery of Bianca and Fernando forces him to reassess his romantic notion. The action of Bianca and Fernando recalls him to his traditional status and inherit-



ance which are expected to preserve his place in time. Their betrayal undermines his identity as well as the means to preserve it: "A cuckold! had my dukedom's whole inheritance/ Been rent, mine honours levelled in the dust." (III. iii. 1780-81) If his identity is traditionally rooted in "inheritance" and "honours," then he must seek his posterity in the future, matching "the glories of my house and name" with the conventional code of revenge. (V.ii. 2615)

Yet, in the closing stage of the play, the Duke comes to a new understanding of posterity. It is not the fulfillment of the social duty but the recognition of the immortal quality of constant affection between Bianca and Fernando that accords him a new insight into the future, an insight that future generations will repeat as "but the story of our fates." (V.iii. 2825) Armed with the knowledge of constancy to affection, the Duke thus is able to create a moral "monument" (2818) which will transcend time and "outlive my outrage." (2934) In this light, his performance of self-sacrifice becomes his enduring "testament" and "memory" for "Bianca's love." (V.iii. 2805, 2827, 2871)

#### 4. The Ceremony in Performance: The Ethic of Affection and Its Theatrical Artifice.

It is when we realize self-sacrifice as a kind of eternalizing conceit that the second ceremonial patterns

in the performance become clear. The very theatrical resolution which is ultimately used to declare the lovers' triumph in death and to celebrate their performance of its assertion emerges as a ceremonial tableau which unites the ethic of constancy to affection with the framework of time. This tableau clarifies our understanding of the earlier key scenes as the ceremonial renderings supportive of this thematic thrust. By elevating the performance of sacrifice to a kind of memorializing ritual act, Ford allows the other scenes to take on equally ceremonial significance and shapes them into a theatre of affection wherein the characters as performers are caught under the aspect of constancy.

A hint of this kind of ceremonial treatment appears in Act I.i, which frames the Pavian court as a dramatic tableau of affection and constancy. The tableau commences with the formal entry of the Duke, followed by his retinue, all in order of importance of their public positions. The Duke, then, publicly extols Bianca's beauty and Fernando's friendship in the Platonic tradition of transcendental soul mates. This tableau of the ceremonial proclamation of indestructible affection is devised so as to draw further attention to the meaning of its performance. The formal, homage-like response is given by Fernando with a suitable traditional reference to "servant," (225) while Bianca is

herself made to image a partner of "a monarch of felicity."  
 (235) Through elaborate decorum of speech and manner, the Duke, Bianca and Fernando define themselves by an externally imposed identity--"the duke," "Friend," "wife," and "husband." Amid this harmonious state of the court, certain notes, nevertheless, jar their seemingly idyllic presentation of romantic love, and introduce the play's other thematic concern. One such note is sounded by Fiormonda who pares down their courtly gestures as "courtship" (239)--a gesture of falsification and insubstantiality. She tests the protested constancy of the Duke's and Bianca's affection by drawing a suppositional situation. She hints at the inevitable gap between the ethic of affection and the performance of the ethic. Fiormonda's private exchanges of "asides" with Ferentes and D'Avolos further stress Fernando's public protestation as a self-conscious acting: "Exceeding good; the man will 'undertake'." (266)

The three subsequent scenes are framed by the similar performances of courtship. They contrast and compare the lovers' ethic of affection and its performance. In Act I.ii, an effect of a performance is introduced by Ferentes' acting out a parodied courtship and by the false eloquence with which he seduces the three women. The aspect of constant affection is particularly emphasized by Ferentes' manipulation of "vow"--a traditional ceremonial emblem of eternal

love. But, his vow is ironically connected with his scornful view of time's working. In reality, his vows are his revenge on time's power to change everything, as he observes it in the female lack of chastity. His perfidious courtship is a merciless projection of this self-image founded on hedonism: " 'Slife! I have got the feat on't, and am every day more active in my trade: 'tis a sweet sin, this slip of mortality, and I have tasted enough for one passion of my senses." (I.i. 397-400) This soliloquy, with its juxtaposition of "mortality" and "passion," is both his blunt response to the time-defying romantic protestations of the Duke, Bianca and Fernando and is a practical demonstration of their insubstantiality. What matters to Ferentes is the effective role-playing of a supposedly constant courtier, by converting the ceremonial vow of marriage into a ceremony of lust so that he is able to enact a victory over "Time," which is "like a turncoat." (360)

In the immediately succeeding scene (I.ii), the ceremonialized performance is equally appealed to as a binding proof of constant affection. Indeed, Fiormond's courtship of Fernando, which culminates in the ritualized offering of a ring and kiss, may be taken as her abiding commitment to him. Appropriately, she declares constancy by ignoring "A testament enacted by the dead" and by investing her performance with a special power of sanction: "Why, man,

that testament is disannulled/ And cancelled quite by us that live," "To new-kiss/ The oath to thee which whiles he lived was his." (526, 527-28, 533-34) However, her ritualized acting undercuts her professed affection. This is a point which Fernando's praise of her constant widowhood suggests. (490-99) In consequence, she reflects ironically on the futility of her outward performance, and presents a contrasting image to the more substantial acts of sacrifice by those who can match affection with the meaningful performances.

More innocent, but equally absurd, is Mauroccio's courtship of Fiormonda. (II.i) He cultivates a verbose style and manner of courtly compliments to Fiormonda which are a grotesque travesty of the tactful performances of the Duke, Bianca and Fernando. His fastidious preoccupations with physical appearances also parody their mutual physical attraction. His narcissistic exercise, however, works as a kind of self-defining ritual. The theatrical nature of his ritual is emphasized by Mauruccio's acting as a presenter and by the eagerness with which he watches his own acting reflected in "the glass" - his own little theatre. (695) Moreover, he has Giacopo who is an attentive, albeit censorious, spectator. In so acting, Mauruccio impossibly seeks to define himself as a courtier and a potential "marquis." (796) In his unceasing attempt to surpass the

traditional image of an ideal lover (as attested by his disparaging remarks to Petrarch, Dante, Sanazzar, and Ariosto) (714-15), he desires to create a new sense of self. But, his ceremonialized acting is more tangibly contrived by the careful placement of the performers, those positioned on the upper stage and the others below. This physical arrangement gives theatrical emphasis on the ritual. It also draws attention to the distance between the ethic of affection and its performance. The scene is theatrical not merely because of Mauruccio's self-conscious acting, but because he has more spectators than he suspects. As Ford notes, "Enter above Duke, Bianca, Fiormonda, Fernando, Courtiers, and Attendants." (676) The split-level staging, physically separating Fiormonda and Mauruccio, is devised so as to comment on the absurdity of his ritual. Thus, Fiormonda disdainfully dismisses his mannerism as "A subject fit/ To be the stale of laughter." (699-700) True to his romantic role, Mauruccio describes in detail his ideal gift to her, a heart-shaped dressing mirror. But, his "conceit" (734) only evokes an inevitable laughter in the spectators above.

With its heavy emphasis on theatricality and role-playing, each of these earlier scenes establishes the proper tone for our ultimate recognition that performance is cere-

mony, a kind of self-defining ritualization.<sup>4</sup> This ritualization of self can bestow solid reality on one's otherwise shifting view of affection. Because "affection," like one's sense of self, is something so undefinable, inconsistent, and individualistic as to make its idea elusive, we can view the characters only in matching their affection to their outward, persuasive performances. In terms of action, the lovers-as-performers set down the criteria governing their behaviors, and it is in accord with these standards that they will be judged. In this light, it is only appropriate that this scene closes with "Giacopo going backward with the glass, followed by Mauruccio complimenting" (799-800) - his meaningless rehearsal of courtship, and with Fernando's equally abortive courtship of Bianca.

As the play draws more characters into the central conflict, the action evolves around the scenes containing ceremonial performances. In Act II.iii, Fernando and Bianca play the ritualized chess match, which is then followed by a tableau of virtue performed by Bianca. The verbal play in the chess game suggests a closer parallel between the game of chess and the more serious game of courtship played

---

<sup>4</sup>I am taking risks by establishing this performance-ceremony equation. My hope is that this assumption will be made clearer when I treat Perkin Warbeck using the life-pageantry metaphor.

out by Fernando. The parallelism is also enhanced by theatrical staging - Fiormonda and D'Avolos as spectators and Fernando and Bianca as players. It is first through double-entendre that the parallelism is accomplished. Fittingly, it is Fiormonda - Bianca's rival - who calls attention to the hidden meaning of the match. As Bianca invites her to "have a mate at chess," (1127) Fiormonda deliberately misunderstands the term "mate," and recommends Fernando as "a fitter mate." (1130) D'Avolos mutters "Are you so apt to try his skill, madam duchess?" (1135), and aptly stresses the pun on the word "skill," Fernando's skill in the chess game and his skill in his courtship. Fernando's response - "'tis a game/ I lose at still by oversight" (1138-39) - then foreshadows the ensuing tableau in which Bianca remonstrates with his suit. Repeatedly, D'Avolos' asides draw attention to the double meaning of the game: "how gladly will she to't! 'tis a rook to a queen she heaves a pawn to a knight's place; by'r lady, if all be truly noted, to a duke's place; and that's beside the play, I can tell ye." (1142-45) With another meaningful verbal play on the slang variant queen/quean, D'Avolos is convinced of Bianca's fall from virtue.

The game itself proves fast and victorious for Fernando:



Fernando. I must not lose the advantage of the game:  
Madam, your queen is lost.

Bianca. My clergy help me!  
My queen! and nothing for it but a pawn?  
 Why, then, the game's lost too: but play.  
 (II.iii. 1160-64)

Though brief in length, the chess game and reality coexist at the same time. Particularly Bianca's cry, "My clergy help me," poignantly foreshadows the following declaration of Fernando who ignores her married status by ecclesiastical sanction. The victor of the game presses on and acts out what the spying D'Avolos calls "ceremony with a vengeance." (1203-03) In response to his plea, Bianca performs a contrasting tableau of virtue, using the formalized verbal style of a public persona appropriate to such a "ceremony." (II.iii. 1205-19) With the skillful manipulation of the royal "we," Bianca "schooled" Fernando in the art of truly courtly manner. (1225) In response, he immediately acts out her schooling in an equally stylized homage: "(Kisses her hand) This glorious, gracious hand of yours; - I swear." (1228-30) Fernando is now an embodiment of the two kinds of "servant": the one in the service of the Duke's friendship and the other in the service of affection.

For Fiormonda and D'Avolos, however, their ceremonial performance is mere appearance. What has been the scene of untainted love becomes the setting for lustful intrigue. Accordingly, the scene closes with Fiormonda's fierce

determination "to stir-up tragedies as black as brave"  
(1266) - a specific allusion to ceremonial theatricality.

The tragic theatricality is conspicuously present in Act II.iv, in which Bianca appears totally deprived of all pretenses of a public persona and enacts the fall of the "queen" of the chess game. Her genuine emotion is emblematically suggested in her physical appearance: "her hair loose, in her night-mantle." (1268) Her outward aspect signifies an allegorized stylization of her conflict between public duty and personal affection. Interestingly, as she wakes the sleeping Fernando, his first awareness of her is in terms of her public persona - "Madam, the duchess!" (1285) But, Bianca proceeds to redefine herself from the sufficiency of her affection: "No by the faith I owe my bridal vows!/ But ever hold thee much, much dearer far/ Than all my joys on earth, by this chaste kiss." (1362-64) She stipulates, however, that

If thou dost spoil me of this robe of shame,  
By my best comforts, here I vow again,  
To thee, to Heaven, to the world, to time,  
Ere yet the morning shall new-christen day,  
I'll kill myself!

(II.iv. 1334-1338)

What she desires is not the physical union, but something far more satisfying, perhaps a civilized constancy between truly affectionate souls, of which the repeated ritualized

exchanges of kisses are an outward sign and covenant. Her stylized capitulation ("Think me a common and most cunning whore") (1355) thus transforms Bianca and Fernando into figures of stoical romanticism, in a ceremony of affection in the extreme. Their mutual affection is so intense as to threaten the traditional conventions, like marriage and socially determined identities. For them, the constancy of their affection becomes a matter of containing it within verbal affirmations and ceremonial gestures. It becomes a matter of maintaining their integrity by self-conscious acting. This is their inflexible code of affection through which they can achieve their permanent true selves. For them, it is by the repeated enactment of a ceremonial "new-vow" of affection (1375) that they are able to leave their imprints on the passing time: "But day comes on;/ What now we leave unfinished of content,/ Each hour shall perfect up." (1375-77)

The masque, in Act III.iv, reflects more conspicuously on the histrionic nature of the characters. It centers in the wild anti-masque of Ferentes' sacrifice by Colona, Julia and Morona, and is a farcical analogy to the more memorable ceremony of self-immolation played out later by the Duke, Bianca and Fernando. In a significant way, the anti-masque emphasizes the general applicability of the genuine emotion-to-performance shift. In the case of the

three women, their initial affection for Ferentes has by now turned to hatred, and their hatred can only find its satisfaction in a murderous revenge. It is a perverse ceremony of self-definition born of Ferentes' lack of constant affection. Denied the status of wife, they elect to enact the perfidy of his courtship ("The women join hands and dance round Ferentes with divers complimentary offers of courtship") (1851-53) and finally "fall upon him and stab him." (1853-54) It is through such performance that they can obtain Nibrassa's and Petruchio's paternal approval which they denied their daughters before ("Petruchio: Stay;/ I'll answer for my daughter"; Nibrassa: "And I for mine.-/ O, well done, girls!") (1898-99)

As the play draws to its final moments, theatrical ceremonialization assumes more a permanent reality and invests the characters' performances with the ultimate meaning of generated constant affection. Thus, in Act IV.i, where Bianca and Fernando play Hymen's role, the marriage ceremony for Morona and Mauruccio, in fact, becomes their makeshift marriage rite which, in reality, is denied to them. (2081-89) Indeed, this substitute rite is for Bianca a private gesture of renunciation of her outward status and is a ceremony of confirmation of her affection. The meaning of this ceremony is enhanced by a preceding scene in which the Duke, abetted by Fiormonda's tirade on social

honor, vows revenge. His avowal is ceremonialized by the gesture of renunciation of his previous romantic notion, by adopting Fiormonda and D'Avolos and "Friends." (2017-20)

At this point, Fernando and Bianca enter the scene, and the Duke welcomes them by ironically calling out "here's three as one: welcome, dear wife, sweet friend." (2027) In reality, unlike Bianca, he is now governed by his social "honour" - his public image as a prince. Thus, he scolds her for petitioning a reprieve for Mauruccio's life on "mine honour." (2041-43) The Duke resorts to time-bound status and position for his self-definition. Even in his "nightly languish of my dull unrest," he dreams of his "honor" in terms of Fernando's usurpation of his "throne." (IV.ii. 2228, 2231) Appropriate to the theatrical ceremonialization inherent in the characters' consciousness, he describes his dream to Bianca in terms of staged ceremony of self-disposition:

Mark what I say, - as I in glorious pomp  
Was sitting on my throne, whiles I had hemmed  
My best-beloved Bianca in mine arms,  
She reached my cap of state, and cast it down  
Beneath her foot, and spurned it in the dust:  
Whiles I - O, 'twas a dream too full of fate! -  
Was stooping down to reach it, on my head  
Fernando, like a traitor to his vows,  
Clapt, in disgrace, a coronet of horns.

(IV.ii. 2230-2238)

Bianca's uncrowning of the Duke is as ritualistically performed as Fernando's coronation. In the Duke's mind, there

is no distinction between dream and reality, nor between his princely duty ("the honour of anointed kings") (2239) and his personal vengeance ("I have a sword . . . To hew your lust-engendered flesh to shreds"). (2242-44) What sounds like ravings in his threat to Bianca's life is really the Duke's compensatory act as an omnipotent ruler of human affairs. The widening estrangement between the Duke and Bianca is illustrated both verbally and in gesture when he physically entrusts her to Fernando's care during his absence. (2277-78)

The widening distance between the Duke and Bianca is more apparent in the tableau of mortality in Act V.i, where her impending death is iconographically suggested in "her night-attire" and in her symbolic physical action of "leaning on a cushion at a table, holding Fernando by the hand." Her costume is not merely a naturalistic clothing appropriate to the "Bed-chamber" setting; it is also an extension of the conventional stage icon of death, such as a shirt, and her posture communicates her willingness to submit to such a death. Fittingly, her pleading to Fernando becomes a lamentation over the irreconcilability between her social status and her true love for Fernando. This kind of love strips her of all worldly obligations and titles. For those who desire to live by the ethic of affection, there is only physical death. But, she prefers the brief life of her

emotional truth ("To purchase one night's rest with thee, Fernando") (2361) to the endless living death of falsehood ("Than be Caraffa's spouse a thousand years"). (2362) He replies in a dirge-like litany, and asserts a paradoxical triumph of their united affection over their physical death ("I will see you first/ Or widowed or buried; if the last,/ By all the comfort I can wish to taste,/ By your fair eyes, that sepulchre that holds/ Your coffin shall incoffin me alive"). (2365-69) His unchanging affection is completed in a kiss which reenacts the ceremony of affection in the extreme. (II.iv)

This tableau's meaning is enhanced by the spatial arrangement of the stage. While Fernando and Bianca enact the ethic of affection, Fiormonda watches them, entering "above." This physical distancing has a symbolic effect which separates her view of affection from that of Fernando and Bianca. Thus, her "asides" almost make her an allegorical figure of "Revenge" (2346) whose sense of honor and justice is defined by conventions and death.

In the following scene, after the Duke bursts upon them and Fernando, in turn, is led away unceremoniously, the apparent defiance of Bianca and her subsequent self-immolation compose a tableau of self-abnegation, and underscore her irrevocable emotional departure from the Duke. Now Bianca, like time ("Death: I wish no less") (2412)

and her external rank and status ("I held Fernando much the properer man") (2433), has left the Duke's control. As the Duke tries to repossess her by accusing her of adultery, she withdraws further and defends her affection and Fernando's friendship as what the Duke himself proclaimed their relationship earlier. She states that what drew her to Fernando was the natural attraction of kindred spirits. As for Fernando, he has kept "The sacred vows of faith 'twixt friend and friend." (2492) However, the Duke believes that her words are only "such immodest language," falsifying her "trespass." (2451, 2552) The Duke, who is now oblivious of "a monarch of felicity," is at a spiritual impasse in his concern about his social status. (2424-27, 2519-21) Seeing that the Duke is unable to comprehend this fatal change in their relationship, Bianca abandons here corporeal existence and offers herself up to the ritual of sacrifice. The Duke momentarily falters, but Fiormonda rallies him by reminding him of his public persona ("dost thou wish/ To blemish all thy glorious ancestors?") (2537-38) Thus, he is compelled to exact revenge. The Duke, as an avenger and betrayed husband, fusing passion and violence in his last possession of her (in his own words, "Give me thy hand, Bianca") (2541), totally defines and discredits his original affection of her. Fittingly, Bianca praises his murder of her (" 'Tis bravely done") (2546) for having



performed his earthly duty. However, she dies with the words of constant affection ("Command my love/ To thy true friend, my love to him that owns it"). (2547-48)

By murdering Bianca, the Duke has satisfied justice according to his society's code. In Act. V.ii, however, his conduct in this affair is on trial. The scene's legal and semi-legal language and gestures help to maintain this assumption.<sup>5</sup> Appropriately, the scene begins with Petruchio who questions Fernando's "honour": "May we give credit to your words, my lord." (2558) To this Fernando proves his innocence by his willingness to "die accursed," (2560) if only he had "any favor from her save a kiss." (2563) In face of his praise of Bianca's virtue, Nibrassa concedes to "believe," and Petruchio urges Fernando to keep "A guard about you for your own defense/ Than to be guarded for security." (2565, 2570-71) At this point, the Duke rushes in, and commences the quasi-formal legal proceeding:

---

<sup>5</sup>In a minor key, this scene anticipates the trial scene of The Lady's Trial. (V.ii) I have underscored those terms which can be interpreted as having legal and quasi-legal significance.

Stand, and behold thy executioner,  
 Thou glorious traitor! I will keep no form  
 Of ceremonious law to try thy guilt:  
 Look here, 'tis written on my poniard's point,  
 The bloody evidence of the untruth,  
 Wherein thy conscience and the wrathful rod  
 Of Heaven's scourge for lust at once give up  
 The verdict of thy crying villainies.  
 I see thou'rt armed: prepare, I crave no odds  
 Greater than is the justice of my cause;  
 Fight, or I'll kill thee.

(V.ii. 2586-2596)

Here, the Duke is assuming the role of an omnipotent judge, but curiously, he himself is on trial, as Fernando challenges his code of law on its own ground: "I charge thee, as thou art a prince,/ Tell me how hast thou used thy duchess?" (2598-99) Seeing the Duke's verdict in the "dagger's crimson dye," (2602) Fernando abandons all thoughts of combat. Instead, he defends Bianca, "an innocent," (2619) in the language of a person accused of ecclesiastical blasphemy and, thus, placed on inquisition:

If ever I unshrined  
 The altar of her purity, or tasted  
 More of her love than what without control  
 Of blame a brother from a sister might,  
 Rack me to atomies. I must confess  
 I have too much abused thee: did exceed  
 In lawless courtship; 'tis too true, I did:  
 But, by the honour which owe to goodness,  
 For any actual folly I am free.

all the wealth  
 Of all those worlds could not redeem the loss  
 Of such a spotless wife. Glorious Bianca,  
Reign in the triumph of thy martyrdom:  
 Earth was unworthy of thee!

(V.ii. 2623-2631, 2636-2640)

As a result, Nibrassa and Petruchio - the witnesses and jury - are compelled to "believe him." (2641) The Duke, too, is persuaded: "Fernando, dar'st thou swear upon my sword/ To justify thy words?" (2642-43) Fernando, in turn, completes his defense by kissing the sword - an act similar to the solemn gesture of swearing on the Bible. Ironically, it is the Duke who now is the guilty party. Recalling "Her clearness in her confidence to die," (2662) he enters the role of a penitent and suppliant "'Kneels, holds up his hands, and, after speaking to himself a little, rises"). (2663-64) This ceremony of trial closes with the Duke's verdict which is to reclaim Fernando as a "friend" and to command Petruchio to inter Bianca "i' the college-church/ Amongst Caraffa's ancient monument." (2679-81) The trial reveals to the Duke the fact of Bianca's and Fernando's innocence versus the incriminating circumstantial evidence, provided by Fiormonda and D'Avolos. Evidence of the Duke's new moral education is seen in his final condemnation of D'Avolos ("Damned villain! bloody villain!") (2682) and a sober knowledge that "No counsel from our cruel wills can win us;/ But ill's once done, we bear our guilt within us." (2683-84)

The closing scene (Act V.iii) brings all the thematic considerations into a spectacular ceremony of sacrifice. In it, the questions of identity, time, and affection are

explained in a fully theatrical performance. Characteristically, the scene begins with a theatrical note in which Roseilli at last throws off the fool's disguise and reveals himself to Fiormonda. He explains to her that his disguise has been a role-playing device ("metamorphosed," "clouded in this shape") (2698-99), which her "scorn" forced upon him. But now, for the last time, he has to know if his "love" can be fulfilled. Consonant with the Duke's repentance, Fiormonda finally realizes his "truth." (2706) Her rueful recognition, "Strange miracle!" (2705), is further stressed by the respectful, formal speech addressed to Roseilli: "Noble lord,/ That better dost deserve a better fate,/ Forgive me: if my heart can entertain/ Another thought of love, it shall be thine." (2708-11) Like Fernando and Bianca, it is in Roseilli's constant affection that she finds her true self. Thus, she forsakes the desperate D'Avolos whose social identity is reduced, at the Duke's command, from "the place of secretary" to "a private man." (2729)

This brief scene is at once a public and intensely personal ceremony of recognition, a duality epitomized in the scene taking place in the church tomb. Ceremonial theatricality is evident in Ford's detailed stage-directions. The solemnity of the occasion is enhanced by "soft music" in the background. Then enters a procession of

friars and court people, followed by the ritual gesture of kneeling. The Duke's rite of sacrifice, which follows, is both private and public "obligations of a mourning heart." (2750) Self-consciously enacting a spectacle of rite, he desires that "I may take/ My last farewell, and bury griefs with her." (2760-61) But, the Duke's sacrificial act is not adequate. Fernando interrupts his rite, dressed in a white "winding-sheet" (2764) - a symbol of purity and death - and coming out of Bianca's tomb, pushes the Duke away from the tomb. Calling the Duke's performance "yet a rape upon the dead" by an "Inhuman tyrant," Fernando makes this public rite a declamatory stage for his own triumph: "know this place/ Is pointed out for my inheritance;/ Here lies the monument of all my hopes." (2769, 2770-72) He wins the race for the Duke's vengeance by drinking a phial of poison which is, in effect, the elixir of love, a release from his earthly body. He wins because his constant affection can be realized and memorialized only in death ("Why, that's the aim I shoot at"). (2787) His spectacular ritual death is his last articulate act and proof of that affection for Bianca. With this testimonial performance, then, Fernando can commend his memory to Roseilli ("love my memory") (2806), and complements the sacrificial death of Bianca. It is through the conversion of his death into an eternalizing ceremony of sacrifice that Fernando is able

to act out a final "victory" of affection over the changes of time ("Thus I - hot flames! -/ Conclude my love, - and seal it in my bosom"; "life-hugging slaves"). (2809-10) 2789) In death, the two souls are at last made fully one, one with each other.

Fernando's conspicuously theatrical and intensely personal performance is matched by the Duke. He also combines a theatrical spectacle with private feelings that sharply contrast with his earlier vacillations induced by Fiormonda and D'Avolos. His last tribute to Fernando and Bianca is not merely a ceremonial bestowal of "fame" (2815) on Fernando, but is also his ultimate realization that his own "name" depends upon his royal performance. Thus, he commands Fiormonda to "Lodge me, my wife, and this unequalled friend,/ All in one monument." (2817-18) This monument, however, is not the kind he craved before. It is, rather, the monument continued in time by "the story of our fates" (2825) which will be told by "any passionate tongue." (2819) After appealing to his memory committed in "their tale" (2826), he makes his proud declamatory act: "They must conclude now for Bianca's love/ Caraffa, in revenge of wrongs to her,/ Thus on her altar sacrificed his life (Stabs himself)." (2827-29) His ritual death complements Fernando's death, and it is an expression of triumph over his time-encumbered "outrage" ("Fools, why,

could you dream/ I would outlive my outrage?"). (2833-34)  
 It is also a paradoxical enactment of the truth that love is a sacrifice. In his death, therefore, his love is eternalized, and restores him to the same memory of Fernando that all remember ("No age hath heard, nor chronicle can say,/ That ever befell a sadder day"). (2889-90)

It seems appropriate that sacrifice gives place to the public ceremony of statecraft, the proper order of the court affairs and the just execution of justice and settlements. Within the structural type of image which the court is consciously trying to create in its ceremony, Fiormonda chooses Roseilli as a husband and the Abbot officially marries them. Then, the new duke immediately orders punishment for D'Avolos by hanging. Next, he commands that "we'll rear a tomb/ To those unhappy lovers, which shall tell/ Their fatal loves to all posterity." (2871-73) When this is complete, Roseilli performs the final symbolic, sacrificial act: "I here dismiss/ The mutual comforts of our marriage bed." (2874-75) In this resolution, the living Roseilli continues the stoicism of the dead Fernando, and concludes the "tragedy of princes" (2869) whose love is sacrifice.

## CHAPTER VIII

### PERKIN WARBECK

#### 1. The "Antic Pageantry" Transmuted: The Ceremonial Structure

In Act V.ii of Perkin Warbeck, Henry VII, in the crucial confrontation with Perkin, dismisses Perkin's claim to the throne in the following manner:

Oh, let him range:  
The player's on the stage still: 'tis his part;  
A' does but act.

Sirrah, shift  
Your antic pageantry, and now appear  
In your own nature, or you'll taste the danger  
Of fooling out of season.  
(V.ii. 68-69, 88-89)<sup>1</sup>

Henry's utterance is important not only because it identifies Perkin's conduct and career as a type of role-playing in a play but also because, by transmuting the old adage "life is a stage," it accords a ceremonial framework of pageantry to Perkin's play of "passion and majesty." It

---

<sup>1</sup>All lines in this chapter are from the following edition of the play: Drama in the English Renaissance II: The Stuart Period, edited by R. A. Fraser and M. Rabkin (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1976), pp. 620-49.



is true that for a Machiavellian prince like Henry, Perkin's performance as a claimant to the throne is as illusory as the actor's playing well what one is not. For Henry, Perkin's script of life is merely a temporary "antic pageantry." However, his view provides us with the very key to the interpretation of the play. The play illustrates in its pageant structure the nature and extent of the illusion of ceremony and the relation between ceremonial illusion and real life. It explores Ford's idea that life is as much the imitation of pageantry as pageantry is of life. By describing Perkin's performance as a kingly claimant, the play speculates on the dimensions of Perkin's role and on the ways in which his role and his actual conduct may be mutual imitations, alternately and reciprocally fusing each other.

As Henry's linking of play and pageantry suggests, Perkin Warbeck is the most ceremonial of all Ford's major plays. The play's action closely resembles a Renaissance civic pageantry which tests and contests player-kings,<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Useful discussions of the form and theme of the English civic pageantry are the following: D. M. Bergeron, English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1971), especially pp. 243-308; A. F. Griffin, Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage (New Haven: College & University Press, 1951), especially pp. 87-111.

and the folk rituals of the May games and the Lord of Misrule.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, I should like to suggest that the play expresses Ford's acute interpretation of man as, essentially, an actor in a ceremonial pageant play. It is a play about playing on a stage and, by extension, on the larger stage of the political world. By implementing different forms of ceremonials, the play asks the question: "How does one order his being?" Perkin's tremendous effort to activate his "own nature" is not "folly" or "madness," as Henry's court dismisses it to be, but, rather, it is a testimony of the power of his faith to create and perfect his

---

<sup>3</sup>C. L. Barber discusses the composition of saturnalian festivals--the May games and the Lord of Misrule--in ways which literature and drama can take over in his Shakespeare's Festive Comedy (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1963), especially pp. 3-57, 193-94, 205-7, and 220-21. I should like to incorporate Barber's discussion of the folk rituals in ways which would illuminate Perkin's conduct as a consummate kingly player whose relentless reliance on symbolic gestures is a testimony to the power of ceremony to do the formidable--that is, to energize one's ideal self into reality.

Although their central interest is not ceremony, the following critics have also given attention to certain formal aspects which strike a similar chord with the ceremonial spirit in Perkin: Jonas A. Barish, "Perkin Warbeck as Anti-History," Essays in Criticism, 20 (1970): 151-71; R. J. Kaufmann, "Ford's Waste Land: The Broken Heart," Renaissance Drama n.s. 3 (1970): 167-87; Michael Neill, "'Anticke Pageantrie': The Mannerist Art of Perkin Warbeck," Renaissance Drama n.s. 7 (1976): 117-50; Peter Ure, "The Introduction" to his edition of Perkin Warbeck (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1968), pp. liv-lxxxiii.

ideal of self. Perkin asserts his mode of existence by the elegantly simple method of trying out his projected "being." This is his way to raise himself above the miserable, melancholy condition of man. His passion for being thus compels him to script his own role in life and to force the outside world to play supporting roles. In his script of life, reality and ideality merge and his assigned role as Richard IV becomes the total subjectivity of actors who see no dramatist beyond themselves.<sup>4</sup>

In fact, Ford's emphasis on Perkin's theatricality strikes a poignant note in terms of the contemporary events occurring around Ford. By the time the play was published (1634), it was difficult to consider the debate on man as an actor in the world of the theatre and in the theatre of the world without taking into account the serious objections being raised by the Puritans, who also by this time were openly antagonistic to the theatre. For my purpose, it is particularly relevant to note that the Puritan objections to ceremony--especially to the practice of the folk rituals and to the outward and visible signs of Laudian religious reforms--were mounting high. Puritans

---

<sup>4</sup>It is in this context that Ford's reference to the actors in the "Epistle Dedicatory" must be viewed: "In other labors you may read actions of antiquity discoursed; in this abridgement, find the actors themselves discoursing: in some kind, practiced as well what to speak, as speaking why to do."

considered both drama and ceremony as a kind of fiction, relying solely on the power of illusion and outward forms at the expense of indisputable fact, "of fact at least as defined by the Puritan."<sup>5</sup> That Perkin Warbeck is such a deviation from that contemporary thinking is suggested by the fact that Ford deliberately chooses for his hero an impostor, a man creating himself in the image of his own imagination. It is as if, by choosing Perkin, Ford was asking of the Puritan critics whether the justification of role-playing pronounced by Guillaume du Vair, the prominent Renaissance neo-stoic, might not be applied to the larger theatre of the world as well:

Let us consider that we come into the world as to a comedie, where wee may not chuse what part we will play, but onely looke that we play that parte well which is giuen vs in charge. If the Poet bid vs play a kings part, we must take care that we doe it well, and so if he charge vs with the porter or clowns part, we must do it likewise; for a man may get as much credit by playing the one wel, as by well acting the other: and like discredit redoundeth vnto him if neither bee done well.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Enid Welsford, p. 384.

<sup>6</sup>Guillaume du Vair, The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks, translated by Thomas James (1598), edited with an introduction and notes by Rudolf Kirk (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1951), p. 80. An interesting side light to James' translation is the fact that James dedicated it to Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, on whose death Ford wrote an elegy, Fame's Memorial.

Significantly, the passage appears in du Vair's discourse of "true honour," which he terms "the glittering & beaming brightness of a good and vertuous action" (p. 78)--a reflection of man's inward moral excellence as reflected by his outward conduct. Ford's philosophy, gleanable even from his early non-dramatic works, is that action is the mark of the truly virtuous. The virtuous detachment in conduct which du Vair recommends as a kind of role-playing, then, strikes a similar chord in Ford's philosophy. Like du Vair, Ford seems concerned with man's conduct and its meaning which his role-playing seems to represent. Ford reveals "a strange truth" of the man concealed behind the historical events retold by the writers.<sup>7</sup> As such, the play allows us to see to a new depth of possibilities in Perkin, whose central kingly virtues lie in his inner life. Perkin's true kingdom is aesthetic, self-created, and perfected in his theatrical, ideal role-playing and pageantry.

Specifically, then, Ford redefines "an antic pageantry" by integrating Saturnalian folk rituals into his structure. The traditional festival ceremonies of the Lord of Misrule and the May games are particularly apt for this play which deals with the meaning of a mock king. The

---

<sup>7</sup>Ford's use of the chronicle writers--such as Francis Bacon and Thomas Gainsford--is investigated by P. Ure in his edition of Perkin Warbeck (London: Methuen & Co., 1968).

essence of the Lord of Misrule is defiance and mockery of all ordinary social laws, and the ritual of abusing authority is performed by some low-born clownish person disguised as a fool or a mock ruler. This mock ruler, or the Lord of Misrule, burlesques majesty by promoting license under the form of order. He is a temporary, festival king, but his rebellious gestures are thought to symbolize man's satiric desire and his possible spiritual freedom. Because of his disregard and mockery of the established world of order, law, and status, he is a danger to society, but in his higher capacity as the spirit of satire, he allows us to see practical reality as a corrector of vice and weakness and as a place which still promises improvement. The ceremony of the May games, however, is a seasonal life-enhancing custom of spring. Instead of being a satire of real life, this ceremony is a compliment to life whose celebration culminates in the ceremony of marriage of the regenerative powers of nature. The celebrants of the ceremony set aside May Day as a day of license and choose a couple to represent nature and disguise them as king and queen. The claim to this mock kingship is often determined by a contest, and the celebrants regard the union of the human king and queen of May to be an indispensable part of the ceremony in order to

promote, on the principle of imitation, the growth and fertility of nature and life.<sup>8</sup>

For my purpose, it is essential to notice that both rituals stress outward spectacles--temporary player-king, with his fictive disguising and his efficacious performance of the role on the one hand and such inherent meanings as saturnalian and celebratory attitudes prompt and communicate on the other. And what mediates outward spectacles and meanings is man's magical consciousness which believes that there is a correspondence between spectacles and meanings and that there is a further possibility of bringing spectacles into reality. A "man might 'gain a deity,' might achieve, by making his own ritual, an unlimited power to incarnate meaning."<sup>9</sup> This consciousness is expressed in the play by Perkin and his friends who envisage their ideal selves. In using a temporary king to bring out symbolic meanings in Perkin's role-playing, then, Ford presents cere-

---

<sup>8</sup>For more detailed accounts of the practice of the traditional folk rituals, see John Brand, Observations on the Popular Antiquities of Great Britain (New York: AMS Press, 1948, rpt), vols. I and II; W. Carew Hazlitt, Faiths and Folklore of the British Isles (New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965), vol. II: Phillip Stubbs, The Anatomie of Abuses (New York and London: Garland Publishing Co., Inc., 1973), vol. I. For the use by playwrights of traditional folk rituals, see above-noted studies by Barber, Welsford, and Anne Richter, Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play (London: Chatto & Windus, 1962), especially pp. 89-138.

<sup>9</sup>Barber, p. 194.

monial patterns analogous to the myths and rituals of folk tradition. In so doing, Ford redefines these patterns as imaginative understructure, role-playing as personally initiated social action. Ford thus civilizes the primitive rituals under the aspect of self-conscious theatricality.

Through this motion of ceremony, I shall trace Perkin's conduct, first, in what I term the Pageantry of Misrule. Perkin is viewed by his opposition, who consider him as a parody of majesty and rule. They are constantly aware that Perkin's ceremonial role-playing is delusory and that his appearance in the world is the sign of disorder and a threat to the established societal scheme and rule. Matching Perkin to a product of the magical, dream-like conjuration, they emphasize his evanescence and insubstantiality. Like the player-king in the folk rituals, Perkin lives, according to his detractors, only in his imagined temporary world.

However, this Pageantry of Misrule is presented along with the second, more important ceremonial thread, the Pageantry of Rule. This ceremonial structure focuses on Perkin's performance and traces his growth as a player-king from his initial claim to the throne to his final public confirmation of his title, where his regal, external action and his internal, personal belief become one. By virtue of his relentless, unwavering perseverance in his



assigned role, his claim to the political rule is transformed into neo-stoic self-governance. His role-playing is intended to show not only what is ideal about kingship but also what is ideal about man. Through a staged pageant ceremony of rule, Ford records the dignity of a man and his ability to design and rule his inner destiny through his consummate role-playing. And it is characteristic of Ford that the validity of Perkin's role-playing is finally certified by the most important ceremony of all--that of the marriage to Katherine whereby she asserts the reality of Perkin's truth and being.

## 2. The Pageantry of Misrule: The Saturnalian Mock King and Traditional Kingship.

In the world of Perkin Warbeck, Perkin's appearance is viewed as a challenge by the mock king to the rule and order of the divinely protected kingship of Henry VII. From the beginning when Henry expresses outrage at the fate which has saddled him "with false apparitions/ Of pageant majesty," Perkin is described as a saturnalian player-king, the mocking lord of misrule who paradoxically forces Henry to feel himself reduced to "a mockery king in state."

(I.i. 2-4) Ford thus opens the play as a kind of test and contest, wherein the established rule is confronted by a pretender, and fills the action with the characters whose

views of rule inevitably reduce Perkin's identity and being to a state of insubstantiality and evanescence.

This is why Henry's courtiers constantly strive to discredit Perkin as the figure of saturnalian misrule. Echoing Henry's displeasure, they describe him as a product of black magic and associate his appearance with the emblems of civil discord and destruction. (I.i. 14-15, 53-62) Perkin's intrusion upon Henry's reign is threatening because of the pretender's possession of seemingly magical power which might confuse and annihilate the reality of Henry. It is, therefore, entirely comprehensible that Henry and his peers agree in stressing Henry's kingship in fact and by claim. (8-9, 26, 34, 73) Because of their confidence in the inviolability of Henry's rule, Perkin's charismatic charm--"a kind of fascination and enchantment"<sup>10</sup>--must be irrevocably destroyed as a diabolical illusion.

The importance of the opening scene is that Perkin, the mock king, has the mysterious power to mobilize and enthrall the entire country, shaking it to its foundations and putting Henry's claim to the throne on the defense. Henry repeatedly must verbalize and assure his position in terms of Heaven's favor of his kingship, as his metaphor

---

<sup>10</sup>This is how Francis Bacon describes the gist of Perkin's charm in The History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh, edited by F. J. Levy (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1972), p. 152.

suggests at the end of the scene ("Come, my true, best friends. These clouds will vanish;/ The sun will shine full; the heavens are clearing"). (140-41) But the fact that he, as well as his courtiers, is forced to react this way is sufficient proof of Perkin's importance as theatrical misrule. Henry's reign depends on a constant struggle to impose his rule upon Perkin's misrule. The threatening force of misrule is suggested by a disproportionate description of Perkin's action in a cluster of ephemeral and disorderly images of magic, clouds, apparitions, madness, spectacles, theatre, war, and malaise; while Henry's action is sparsely mentioned, identifying his sanctity with the shining sun. This illustrates the belief of Henry's court that the power of misrule is more potent than the denial of misrule. Indeed, Daubeney contemptuously denies Perkin as if he were a traditional misrule played by a village fool ("Jolly gentleman, more fit to be a swabber/ To the Flemish after a drunken surfeit"). (125-26) But undeniably, Perkin is fast becoming the image of majesty through the offices of the magical identification of his ceremonial name with his identity ("She has styled him 'the fair white rose of England'"). (124) Though Henry's court unceasingly points to Perkin's ambiguous milieu and identity, their rhetorical rejection of Perkin is insufficient to counteract the stubbornly effective incantation of Perkin's performance.

Henry's reaction naturally takes the form of cold pragmatic action. He begins to act by first discovering who the "great ones" are among his men. (I.ii) Clifford is the first to be brought in for disclosure. As appropriate to the magical aura surrounding Perkin's misrule, Clifford's confession of treason is obtained as if by exorcizing a bad spell. (12-14, 18-19) Henry himself verifies Clifford's confession and recounts Perkin's progress as an unnatural and unreliable phenomenon. (35-46) He aptly calls attention to the instability which accompanies a protean misrule like Perkin's--just as magic can change a person's external shape, so can it change his destiny, and this is why Henry as a symbol of stability and order must be upheld.

But Perkin's saturnalian potency is most sharply felt by Henry, who himself experiences the extent of the magical infection spreading in his court. His dismay--"Churchmen are turned devils" (80)--is an involuntary expression of how deeply his awareness of Perkin is based in a saturnalian reversal of Henry's own values. But more importantly, what clinches Henry's consternation is the knowledge of Stanley's involvement, and this intelligence affects him as if he himself were transported into the realm of unreality, where, as if to nullify his own objection to magical transformation, he is forced to alter his supposedly

unalterable self. Stanley's treachery is imagined as occurring in a magical dream, which is Perkin's domain ("Alter, Lord Bishop?/ Why, Clifford stabbed me, or I dreamed a' stabbed me"). (89-90)

The irony of this brief but crucial dream tableau is that despite his protestations and denials of Perkin, Henry is affected to the point where his outbursts, contrary to his customary self-possession, must be remonstrated on by Durham and Urswick ("You lose your constant temper," "this passion ill becomes ye;/ Provide against your danger"). (113, 120-21) Urswick's caution "against your danger" is aptly made, for Stanley's betrayal, acting as Perkin's direct incursion on Henry's rule, endangers Henry's very identity and status:

Sir William Stanley! Who? Sir William Stanley,  
My chamberlain, my counselor, the love,  
The pleasure of my court, my bosom friend,  
The charge and the controlment of my person,  
The keys and secrets of my treasury,  
The all of all I am! I am unhappy.  
Misery of confidence--let me turn traitor  
To mine own person, yield my scepter up  
To Edward's sister and her bastard duke!

(I.ii. 104-12)

What has caused his anger and despair is a curious emotional reversal which acts as a foil to Perkin's position. Not only does his denial of magic become his acknowledgment of it, but also magic is associated with dreaming which tends to appear in connection with the ideas of both the actor and

king.<sup>11</sup> Both magic and dreaming are symbols of unsubstantial and unreal illusion. By dreaming of assassination by Clifford, then, Henry unwittingly makes his kingly rule as illusory and perilous, and his kingly conduct as unsubstantial and unreal as Perkin's theatrical misrule. Henry naturally recovers quickly, as attested to by his command for Stanley's confinement. But this momentary show of weakness allows us to see the separation of Henry as the king and Henry as an individual and thus provides us with a glimpse of Henry as a player-king as well.

Of course, Henry does not view himself as a vulnerable, temporary player-king, like Perkin. This is why he readily accepts the peers' decision for Stanley's execution despite his protestations of former trust and friendship. (II.ii) However, the incident with Stanley underscores the thin line separating Henry from Perkin. It stresses the fact that kingship is something to be made--Henry's by virtue of policy and military power on the one hand, and Perkin's on the strength of magic and theatrical imagination on the other. In fact, both Henry and Perkin are engaged in a kind of self-attainment, engaged in the creation of style where role-playing must be fused with life. Despite the

---

<sup>11</sup>For the customary association of kingship (and flattery) and the actor with dreams, see Anne Richter, pp. 124-28, and Caroline Spurgeon, Shakespeare's Imagery (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1966), pp. 190-91.

differences emphasized and proclaimed by Henry and his peers, Henry, as one version of a player-king, is closer to Perkin than he suspects. Their similarity becomes more conspicuous as Henry, with Stanley now safely out of the way, closes in on Perkin, who is under James' protection. Like Clifford and Stanley, James is viewed by Henry as bound by magic, and Henry is determined to break the spell. (III.i) But curiously, what he deems a wise policy is presented in terms analogous to magic ("I have a charm in secret that shall loose/ The witchcraft wherein young King James is bound,/ And free it at my pleasure without bloodshed"). (33-35) A "charm in secret," which he hopes to have, again suggests the inversion of the role of true king and "counterfeit." When he enters into negotiation with Hialas to bring his marriage proposal to James--his "charm in secret"--into fruition, he talks of his action in terms of theatricality. (III.iii) As Perkin, the counterfeit, imitates Henry, so does Henry "imitate" the wisdom of King Ferdinando (12-14) and assures Hialas of his own promptness to learn his own part to play ("I learn sometimes without a teacher"). (35)

In hard reality, however, Henry's deliberate exploitation of theatrical and magical terms is a reflection of his craft, which his peers deem as Henry's divine wisdom. Accordingly, as Henry's victory becomes more assured (as

seen in the military subjugation of the Cornish rebellion and James' acceptance of the marriage proposal at the expense of Perkin's dismissal from his court), Henry again stresses Perkin's incursion as an absolute unreality. So self-assured is he that even Perkin's temporary escape does not disturb him. Likening Perkin's royal undertaking to "some unquiet dream," Henry envisions an ideal world preserved and perpetuated under his rule. (V.ii. 8) For Henry, Perkin has been a foil necessary to his nobility and rule, not a threat to his rule as he mistakenly imagined. (6-9) Thus, in abnegating both "dream" and the force of magic, Henry completes what he has set out to do: the total and irrevocable annihilation of Perkin.

Yet, there is an ironic reversal occurring even within Henry's court once Perkin is made prisoner. In the words of Daubeney, who brings Perkin to Henry's presence, he is "a shadow/ Of majesty, but in effect a substance/ Of pity." (V.ii. 32-34) His surprising, changed view of Perkin from shadow to substance, from scorn to pity, suggests the disturbing possibility of self-actualization, the possibility that Perkin may have willed himself into "pageant majesty." The hint that pretense can be reality is seen in Henry's reluctant admission that "I behold, 'tis true,/ An ornament of nature, fine and polished,/ A handsome youth indeed." (36-38) Could it be that "an ornament" is



merely a veritable extension of "nature" as well and, because it is fine and polished, an ornament can be more real than crude nature? Paradoxically, Perkin's stubborn refusal to withdraw from his role-playing causes Henry to comment that "The custom, sure, of being styled king/ Hath fastened in his thought that he is such" (132-33), and this comment works as if to cancel out his official view of Perkin as a player and a magic-born misrule. Indeed, at the end, Perkin is reduced to a creature of magic--a view which Urswick corroborates. (105-11) But their insistence on Perkin's theatricality and magic milieu in turn puts in relief his distinct realm where the assumption of a role becomes a part of one's identity ("own nature") and magic becomes imagination. Contrary to the official view of Perkin as misrule, his perseverance in what he deems the ideal role in life becomes an entirely different rule--a kind of severe and yet admirable self-governance. Perkin's performance is elevated into the realm of higher conduct. As a result, the imminent prospect of his death inspires in one an ironic wish that "the mock king be real, that the self be all the world or set all the world at naught."<sup>12</sup>

This ironic wish is most acutely felt by James, who takes Perkin under his protection and supports his royal

---

<sup>12</sup>Barber, p. 220.

undertaking. Although James is eventually reduced to a pragmatic, Machiavellian prince like Henry, his treatment of Perkin throws a considerable light on the nature of Perkin. From the beginning, there is a different overtone concerning Perkin in the Scottish court. The tone is set when Crawford announces Perkin's audience with James to his peers. Perkin is introduced as "a Duke of York," a title which allows for the fact that through the indefinite article "a", Perkin's status is accorded with more room for ambivalent and wistful speculation than willful and absolute suspicion. (I.ii. 178) James' own speech to his peers (II.i. 18-34) clarifies this tone: James intends to support Perkin's claim as part of his commendable exercise of the chivalric, kingly rule of honor. In James' view, Perkin appears already to be "a much distressed prince" (29) and, therefore, seems to deserve "compassion," which is one of the hallmarks of his honorable rule. The fact that Perkin appeals to James' aid--together with the endorsements of Perkin by the French and Bohemian kings--seems to have struck the right chord with James' chivalrous heart. As a result, his audience with Perkin is anticipated as a state ceremony where "majesty encounters majesty." (39) In fact, Perkin does exceed James' anticipations. His verbal performance in recounting his "story" (40-79) evokes in James admiration ("He must be more than subject who can utter/ The language of a king, and such is

thine"). (103-4) Unlike Henry, James views Perkin's role-playing as "high attempts of honor." (113) Along with Katherine ("I should pity him/ If he should prove another than he seems") (119-20), James is willing to suspend disbelief and finally admits that:

Take this for answer: be whate'er thou art,  
Thou never shalt repent that thou has put  
Thy cause and person into my protection.

. . . . .  
Dream hence afflictions past.

(II.i. 105-12)

For James, Perkin is real, and his active wish that Perkin might be the real prince is answered by Perkin's superb role-playing. In this respect, James' invitation to "Dream hence afflictions past" is an ironic gloss to Henry's dream tableau which is his ineffectual protest against Perkin's reality. (I.iii) Contrary to Henry, James affirms the dream, whereby Perkin is recast into a royal martyr.

James' rule, then, stands at the opposite end of Henry's. While Henry's rule is based on diplomatic and military strategy, James' rule consists of the vocabulary of chivalry--especially that of honor. Not only does he see his public approval of Perkin as a high mark of his chivalric honor, but it means devotion appropriate to his kingly duty. Honor is a reflection of ideal kingly conduct, like illustrations for a courtesy book. James' rule, then, becomes fundamentally a matter of the heart, an attitude of

mind. James' honor, bound up as it is with his rule and status, thus magnifies and reinforces Perkin's self and status rather than diminishes them. Perkin's character is made over to be a matter of his noble heart and integrity, not a matter of birth, blood, or title. James' gift of marriage, therefore, has the momentous effect of presaging Perkin as the "king of hearts." (IV.v. 32)

In contrast to James' proclaimed view of Perkin, ambiguous feelings do not completely disappear among his peers. Particularly, in the eyes of Huntly, James has created, in Perkin, a May king and, in Katherine, a May queen. Their union is a magical abuse of the sanctity and solemnity of the marriage ceremony:

Is not this fine, I trow, to see the gambols,  
To hear the jigs, observe the frisks, b' enchanted  
With the rare discord of bells, pipes and tabors,  
Hotch-potch of Scotch and Irish twingle-twangles,  
Like to so many quiristers of Bedlam  
Trolling a catch? The feasts, the manly stomachs,  
The healths in usquebaugh and bonny-clabber,  
The ale in dishes never fetched from China,  
The hundred thousand knacks not to be spoken of,  
And all this for King Oberon and Queen Mab,  
Should put a soul int' ee.

(III.ii. 2-12)

Huntly's sentiment is a stronger restatement of Henry's view: Perkin is a fraud and a spirit of misrule, devoid of responsibility and legitimacy. By emphasizing the discord and chaos symbolized by the contentious music and frantic dance, Huntly sees the marriage rite as a holiday festivity

whose moment and power must fade like a mad, pagan dream. His denigration of the marriage between Perkin and Katherine, on the other hand, becomes a denigration of James' idea of rule grounded in honor. Although Huntly ultimately resigns himself to James' view of kingship (57-59), he cannot refrain from uttering acid contempt for James' ceremonial celebration of the marriage: it is only a fatuous spectacle ("The King and all the others come, a meeting/ Of gaudy sights"). (83-84)

Despite his ceremonial show of honor, James' idea of honor is not sufficient for Perkin's undertaking. This becomes apparent when, despite all the preparations for combat, a highly ceremonial encounter with the English troop leads to James' effortless submission to Henry's "charm in secret." As Durham shrewdly observes, the encounter marks a rather anticlimactic change of the heart in James concerning Perkin ("here's but a prologue,/ However confidently uttered, meant/ For some ensuing acts of peace"). (IV.i. 61-63) Thus, in James' eventual acquiescence to Henry's terms, we see not only the limit of his honor but also the emergence of James made over into a Henry-like Machiavellian prince. In this guise, James opts for the political and hierarchical enhancement of the status quo and justifies his action in the name of Christian virtues and princely wisdom. (IV.iii. 42-43, 73-77)

To his credit, James does not renounce Perkin even when he dismisses him from his court. In fact, James' parting epithet for Perkin, "cousin" (IV.iii. 65, 105), seems to reemphasize James' lingering wistfulness that Perkin be "such thou sayest thou art." (97) By the terms of James' or Henry's handling of Perkin, then, the traditional practice of kingly rule is neither adequate nor defines the real sense of Perkin's self. As Ford contrasts James and Henry, it is as if the established rule were somehow insufficient to cope with what they deem misrule. As James' final reservation about Perkin implies, there remains a persistent sense of the possibility that role-playing enhanced by magnetic performance is, in fact, a projection of one's true identity. By presenting the sharply contrasting wishes of Henry and James, Ford seems to ask "what would it feel like to be a man who played the role of festive celebrant his whole life long."<sup>13</sup> In the official opinion, Perkin's misrule is certain to disappear with his execution, but in the private realm of Perkin's inward life, it is redefined by the neo-stoic self-rule--ethical basis of his role-playing. It is this self-rule over the mutable political worlds and destinies that creates and preserves Perkin's true and permanent identity. Perkin's self-rule seems to justify a

---

<sup>13</sup>Barber, p. 73.

proclamation of challenge to Henry which the historic Perkin laid down by reversing Henry's rule to that of "misrule and mischief now reigning in England."<sup>14</sup>

3. "A great attempt . . . a greater danger": The image of the Court as "Truth and State"

The validity of the charge which the historic Perkin made against Henry's (and, obliquely, James') rule becomes persuasive when I examine the court in which the dramatic action takes place. The court provides the ambivalent Perkin with ethically and socially adequate goals. It also presents itself as a larger society whose practiced values Perkin's conduct calls into question.

Acting as the sphere of "state and truth," the court, then, vividly shows the contrast which Machiavelli draws between the two kinds of worlds and rules; namely, between "the way men live" and "the way they ought to live."<sup>15</sup> Clearly, Henry's court represents "the way men live" and Perkin's court "the way they ought to live," and there is a cleavage between those two modes of life--one motivated by the imperatives of politics and the other motivated by the imperatives of ethics--each attempting to claim its

---

<sup>14</sup>Bacon, p. 182.

<sup>15</sup>Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince, translated, edited with an introduction by Daniel Donno (New York: Bantam Books, 1966), Chapter XV, p. 56.

supremacy. To underscore these differences, Ford directs our attention to the widening gulf between Henry's political court and Perkin's private court. This gulf ironically suggests Henry's "misrule" as his spiritual dependency in spite of the final restoration of political order and stability. In the end, we are made to see that Henry's court is merely a blind to suggest an altogether different kind of the court where "truth and state" are redefined as true love and self-governance. It is a court which illuminates Perkin's theatrical misrule as an example of spiritual freedom and lasting self. Thus, by converting "The threats of majesty" into an impeccable role-playing of husband and claimant, Perkin makes his "strength of passion" a bulwark against Henry's misrule and fortune's decrees ("Epilogue").

Henry's court, then, is a court in which political activity leads to the perpetuation of moral compromise. For essentially conformist ambitions of a Machiavellian politician like Henry and his peers, it is imperative for them to remain in political power. It is in the nature of such a court that they strive to create a myth of Henry's sacredness upon which to build the court hierarchy. Indeed, Henry's sacredness is important, for it not only secures their power but it also defines who they are ("Eminent titles may indeed inform who their owners are," 'Epistle Dedicatory'). Henry is thus cast as a divine image by



Durham: "Mercy did gently sheathe the sword of Justice/ In lending to this blood-shrunk commonwealth,/ A new soul, new birth, in your sacred person." (I.i. 24-26) Daubeney compliments and reinforces Durham's image of Henry:

Edward the Fourth, after a doubtful fortune,  
Yielded to nature, leaving to his sons,  
Edward and Richard, the inheritance  
Of a most bloody purchase. These young princes  
Richard the tyrant, their unnatural uncle,  
Forced to a violent grave. So just is heaven.  
Him hath your majesty by your own arm,  
Divinely strengthened, pulled from his boar's sty  
And struck the black usurper to a carcass.  
(I.i. 27-35)

Apropos of the peers' constant concerns with "Eminent titles," there is an unmistakable undercurrent of anxiety regarding this apparently ideal image of Henry. For, hidden under this exalted view of Henry is Daubeney's unconscious feeling that Henry might not be so legitimate as he claims. Daubeney's recountings of previous historical events sum up this: Edward IV took the throne after the murder of Henry VI; the deaths of his sons, Edward (Simnel) and Richard (Perkin), were a divine punishment for the crimes of their father; Richard III's violent death at the hands of Henry Richmond (Henry) was, in turn, Richard III's divine punishment. In short, those deaths which secured Henry's succession are the results of usurpation, and, thus, Henry himself

is not so clean as he seems to be.<sup>16</sup> What is important is not his damaging implication alone, however; what must be held in mind is Daubeney's thought that reveals his conspicuous self-interest and expediency. By ignoring Henry's shaky grounds of legitimacy, Daubeney instead recasts Henry's acquisition of the throne as a sign of divine intervention.

This ironic view of Henry's divine nature becomes more apparent in light of Stanley's presence among them. In fact, Stanley reassures Henry that "The throne is filled, sir." (72) Like dreaming, flattery is associated with the unsubstantiality and unreality of kingship.<sup>17</sup> Since Henry is continually surrounded by obsequious courtiers, he seems to be in the world of dream--a charge which they place on Perkin. This image of Henry makes him a person who is dependent on the external titles and status.

One conspicuous example of Henry's dependency occurs in his treatment of Stanley. (II.ii) Henry's dependency is

---

<sup>16</sup>On the different reading of the line "So just is heaven," and its implication, I am indebted to Phillip Edwards' article where, unlike other editors of the play, he places a period, instead of a comma, after "heaven" ("The Royal Pretenders in Massinger and Ford," Essays and Studies, 1974, pp. 24-25). He thus shifts the burden of the line's meaning to the preceding, not succeeding, lines. I have adopted Edwards' interpretation of the line in ways the line supports my basic view of Henry as a dependent person.

<sup>17</sup>Spurgeon, pp. 190-91.

best seen in relief through his peers' choral reassurance of his title versus Stanley's conduct. Henry's seeming reluctance to execute Stanley is thus reprimanded by Durham, who sees his mercy as having self-nullifying effects. If Henry is willing to spare Stanley, then it means at once the admission of Perkin's claim and the resulting collapse of the established order and titles. (15-25) As if to reemphasize the importance of titles and names, Oxford swears vengeance in the name of his family: "By Vere's old honors,/ I'll cut his throat dares speak it." (26-27) When Henry defers the final decision to the peers and evades the confrontation with Stanley, Henry's show of mercy contrasts sharply with Stanley's show of spiritual resolution.

Stanley's final moment, which the peers view as a scene of abject degradation, is thus transformed into a ceremony of farewell to earthly titles and names. Facing death, Stanley realizes not "who their owners are" but "what" he is--"nothing" according to the social stratification of being. (73) He realizes that "truth" and "the state's safety" (81), upon which the names and titles are built, are different from what he had come to learn as truth and state: they have to do with spirit rather than fact. Hence, Clifford's defense of his betrayal in the name of "truth" and "the state's safety" is deemed by Stanley as a breach of trust and an abandonment of responsibility and

commitment. Life to such as Clifford becomes a matter of physical survival and protection, not a matter of spirit ("Mercy, how dear is life to such as hug it!"). (82) His meaning is thus visually enacted by his making "a cross on Clifford's face with his finger"--an emblematic tableau of spiritual betrayal. (85-93) This ceremony of farewell, then, defines Stanley's renunciation of a mortality defined by names and titles, and his triumphant assertion of spirit prompts him to see his action blameless ("I shall stand no blemish to his house/ In chronicles writ in another age"). (100-101)

As Perkin's central follower, Stanley adumbrates and compliments Perkin's self-rule and the conduct of his court. Set against this image of Stanley (the revealer of "the way they ought to live"), Henry's avoidance of Stanley looks cowardly and churlish. Henry's swift transference of the office of the chamberlain to Daubeney again reemphasizes the unreliability of self-definition based on names and titles.

Admittedly, Henry is not a downright villain, nor can his rule be said to be villainous. He is only an example of Machiavelli's ideal ruler, attesting to "the way men live." But even though everywhere Henry's rule wins practical victory, its ethos of success is not somehow able to measure up to the qualities of truth as adumbrated by Stanley and as represented by Perkin. Indeed, Perkin represents spiritual

freedom and personal integrity. As such, he does not need the accepted norm of status nor a political state or laws. As a result, his theatrical misrule becomes his aesthetic self--a being of beauty not only in his outward appearances but also in his ethical conduct. Nowhere, perhaps, is Perkin's spiritual freedom more discernible than in Perkin's friends. Unlike Henry, Perkin attracts and wins those who can gain nothing practical from him but his admiration and praise for their endeavors and integrity. As Perkin chooses his role as an expression of freedom, so do they choose the role of friends as an expression of their independence.

It is in James' court that we have different views of Perkin's friends. Especially Katherine and, through her, Dalyell, Jane, and ultimately Huntly represent Perkin's court. Katherine's final stand on Perkin is prefigured in her response to Huntly, who looks on Dalyell's suit favorably:

For respects  
Of birth, degrees of title, and advancement,  
I nor admire nor slight them; all my studies  
Shall ever aim at this perfection only,  
To live and die so that you may not blush  
In any course of mine to own me yours.  
(I.ii. 134-39)

In her gentle refusal of Dalyell's suit, her idea of perfection is further clarified:

If the stream  
 Of your protested service, as you term it,  
 Run in a constancy more than a compliment,  
 It shall be my delight that worthy love  
 Leads you to worthy actions, and these guide ye  
 Richly to wed an honorable name.

(I.ii. 148-53)

These speeches crystallize Katherine's character. While recognizing the necessity of external self-identification by names and titles, she emphasizes a more meaningful norm for which belief and action stand as mutually enforcing metaphors. Action ("Run in a constancy more than a compliment") is a symbol of emotional belief ("your protested service"), and belief is a way to achieve "perfection," an integration of belief and action. It is only in this perfection that true honor resides. In terms of personal ethics, she reorders Huntly's idea of honor which assumes that names are fixed and final according to the social tradition ("Consider who thou art, and who: a princess,/ A princess of the royal blood of Scotland"). (103-104) Her exchange of metaphors and realities of honor is, thus, closely related to her identity--"who" she is.

Though Katherine is soon put to test her "honor" in her encounter with Perkin, she undergoes the test successfully. In the end, she proves that her belief can stand the strains of experience (action) and affirms what she is (the wife of Perkin), not who she is (a princess of royal blood).

In a similar way, Katherine's conduct is complemented by Dalyell. His view of himself is presented in the exchange between him and Huntly on geneology in Act I.ii. As he is painfully aware, he is not entitled to offer a marriage suit to Katherine: being non-royal. But the ground of his suit is his "first/ And native greatness." (38-39) The importance of his innate quality is contrasted by the unreliability of one's blood. He himself is descended of Adam Mure, who is the first begettor of "the race of James." But time, far from reinforcing that truth, blurs and obscures it while downing what is substantial and significant. (29-42) This is why Dalyell is quick to perceive the meaning of Katherine's "perfection." Instead of becoming a spurned lover, he, thus, chooses the role of being her constant "friend." What is more, he performs his role so superbly that his conduct evokes admiration in Henry's camp. (V.i. 104-109) In a minor key, Jane, Katherine's maid-in-waiting, fulfills her role by staying loyal to her mistress. To Katherine's counsel to return home to Scotland for safety's sake, Jane replies: "There is no safety whiles your dangers, madam,/ Are every way apparent" (V.i. 38-39)--a sentiment echoed by a socially negligible servant ("Pardon, lady:/ I cannot choose but show my honest heart;/ You were ever my good lady"). (40-41) In a

comical way, Perkin's "counselors" also attest to the importance of acting out one's belief.

In the end, Perkin's friends are used to expose the insufficient values of "the way men live." The figures who remain in political power provide a counterpoint to the passionate and truthful playing of roles which Perkin's friends take up. In their view, role-playing is not deceptive; on the contrary, it is a form of self-acceptance and self-discovery. Playing a role is a veritable acceptance and discovery of the ethically motivated selves, and thus it becomes an autonomous social action. By fusing a role with the vision of one's ideal self, Perkin's court legitimizes the extension of an emotional reality beyond the confines of imagining. Their role-playing is, indeed, "a great attempt" and becomes "a greater danger" to Henry because they see no alternatives beyond their chosen roles. Their radical individualism converts only the ideal role into a real self. Though truth and state are so much bandied about by the various characters, Perkin's court creates an entirely different truth at a level beyond pragmatism. By turning role-playing into a way of self-governance, Perkin's friends sustain Perkin as a symbolic image which may reflect and redeem the melancholy, changeable rule of Henry.



#### 4. The Pageantry of Rule: The Ethic of Self-Governance and Its Performance.

It is when I realize Perkin's theatrical misrule as an outward and visible expression of an aesthetic being that the second ceremonial pattern--The Pageantry of Rule--emerges. It is not a pattern of arguments but a pattern of crystalizations and confirmations of Perkin's identity and lasting self. By converting his role-playing into a symbolic medium of self-expression, his aspiration for political rule is reorganized into a radical mode in which his passion, language, and gestures are the civilized and ennobled artifice. Perkin undertakes the very creation of "a strange truth" as if to suggest through his theatrical misrule the civilized concord which ceremony imitates.

It is this combination of theatrical and ethical man that becomes obvious in Perkin's formal appearance at James' court, which is seen as a ceremonial tableau portraying majesty. (II.i) The theatrical tone is announced physically by the stage arrangement, in which the court ladies appear "above," like the audience of the theatre, looking down on the contest of the two expressions of rule. The ethical tone is created visually and verbally by James' cultivation of a world of elegance which is attuned to Perkin's aesthetic self. James' idea of honor is emblemized in "my arms." (37) When Perkin is courteously

ushered into James' presence (the highly detailed stage directions are present), James and Perkin embrace before the throne--a symbol which lends a crucial credence to the role-playing by Perkin. It is a tableau of majesty, created through the high court manner in which a role-playing and a role in life are fused and indistinguishable.

Caught under what almost can be described as a staged ritual, Perkin's "vulgar story of a prince's ruine" (44) is recounted in terms of theatricality and complementary civility which are particularly favored by James. With proper circumspection and restraint, his "progress" and "tragedy" (57, 59) of his early life are rendered as if they were a moral exemplum of an unfortunate prince. He describes himself with the royal "we"--"malice against us," "from our nursery," "our misfortunes," "Edward the Fifth our brother"--a verbal stratagem which not only lends his story a proverbial moral tone but also discredits some of the same historic facts recounted by Henry's court. (I.i) But a subtle transformation occurs in his verbal stratagem as he begins "recollecting who I was." (75) He attains his individual self first by shifting from the royal "we" to the personal "I," and this verbal shift causes his story to change from the generic "story of a prince's ruin" to a more personalized history of "my life." Secondly, his "recollection" is recounted as an actor learns and unlearns his part

("taught to unlearn myself," "when disdain . . . prompted me to thoughts/ Of recollecting who I was"). (67-79) The obliteration of the boundary, in Perkin's awareness, between the theatrical self and the individual self thus injects the exciting possibility that Perkin has activated himself into what he deems to be an ideal being. Of particular interest concerning Perkin's theatrical self is James' reprimand of Perkin's emotionalism which threatens to lead him "To fly upon invectives." (80-84) James' reprimand works as if he were gauging Perkin's performance. Even if Perkin is playing a part with full conviction, the role-playing alone is not a guarantee of his ethical superiority. Conviction and self-creation must be supported by a consistent performance. This is why Perkin quickly sees the meaning of James' rebuke and rearranges his speech to show the noble resolution which is his innate make-up. His noble, elegant language is what James understands as "The language of a "king" (104)--sufficient material evidence for James to decide his national policy. His generally flawless performance earns the praise of the initially skeptical audience "above" the stage. As the Countess of Crawford's response indicates ("I have not seen a gentleman/ Of a more brave aspect or goodlier carriage;/ His fortunes move not him") (115-17), Perkin's performance is taken as convincing proof of his good soul.

This tableau of majesty illustrates "what Perkin is"--namely, his identity caught under the aspect of self-governed performance. Act II.iii introduces another important self-defining element--true love--which blends his ceremonial court majesty with another kind of majesty. True love comes to Perkin in the form of the marriage ceremony at which James himself officiates. James considers the marriage as the culmination of their harmonious love. (58-60) For Perkin, the marriage is a public seal upon his integrity and worth. (78-80) At the same time, the sanctity of ceremony makes him a "sovereign" of another "kingdom," which is Katherine's "heart." (81-82) This presages the prophetic image of Perkin as the "king of hearts" when he spurns Henry's epithet of misrule in Act V and becomes the climactic visual icon of self-governance.

The marriage ceremony has a crucial impact on Katherine's identity as well. Formerly, she has defined her social action as that of doing "The duty of a daughter." (I.ii. 134) Now she has to see herself as "the prince's wife" (II.iii. 88), and although she desires to be both a dutiful daughter and a loving wife, Huntly's unwillingness to bestow a father's blessing on marriage puts her in harsh conflict. Her ceremonialized kneeling gesture, entreating Huntly's blessing, shows a tension emblematically enacted--the tension between her personal wish (which Huntly has

disregarded as "a common servile rage/ Of female wanton-ness") (I.ii. 111-12) and her public image (Huntly now calls her "lady"). (93) This tension can only be resolved through her adherence to the chosen role, only through what she has termed "perfection" and "a constancy" to her role. (I.ii)

The marriage ceremony, then, has the effect of establishing Perkin's identity both in public and private terms: it certifies him as an acknowledged claimant to the public throne but also offers the stage for his more private drama. Playing simultaneously the roles of the claimant and the husband, Perkin creates his new reality in which majesty and love stand as intertwined metaphors. The majesty is an outward symbol of his self-governance, and his love is a medium which substantiates it. This combination of self-rule and true love is clearly seen in the irreproachable role-playing by Perkin and Katherine in Act III.ii, which is centered in the bridal masque. The verbal and physical performance of Perkin and Katherine is an extension of their substance and belief, and their performance is being subtly transmuted into a theatrical ritualization, a kind of self-defining magical act.

In a minor key, the bridal masque itself reflects the general applicability of the "belief to identity to performance" orientation. In reality, it is a wild anti-masque

staged by Frion and performed by the counselors. The enthusiasm with which they prepared this masque (II.ii. 108-85) reemphasizes the histrionic tendency of the counselors' conduct. However, the masque is also their expression of their belief in Perkin. Humble though it may be, the masque is a measure of their mettle to show "how much/ We outshine them in person of account,/ By so much more will our endeavors meet with/ A livelier applause." (163-66) Understood this way, the masque foreshadows the loyalty of the counselors. As we will see, to the end, they do not withdraw from their roles. As A-Water will later testify, they will hold to their original choices. (V.ii)

Following as it does the anti-masque, the subsequent scene between Perkin and Katherine is a masque of majesty and love, which emphasizes the importance of self-rule and love. Perkin describes the scene as "a parting ceremony." (III.ii. 141) In it, Perkin's self-rule is conspicuously translated into a restrained, formalized utterance of true love:

Now, dearest, ere sweet sleep shall seal those eyes,  
 Love's precious tapers, give me leave to use  
 A parting ceremony, for tomorrow  
 It would be sacrilege to intrude upon  
 The temple of thy peace.

(III.ii. 139-43)

This periphrastic utterance imparts his personal code--civilized ornate manners--in which highly wrought emotions

are kept in check as a mark of respect and true love. This chivalric awareness of Katherine is further illuminated in his concern for her in the oncoming war: "The churlish brow/ Of war, fair dearest, is a sight of horror/ For ladies' entertainments." (148-50) It is also in the nature of his theatrical ceremonialization of self that he images his stoical last moment by merging his role-playing with his role in life, worthy of Katherine's love and memory:

If thou hear'st  
 A truth of my sad ending by the hand  
 Of some unnatural subject, thou withal  
 Shalt hear how I died worthy of my right  
 By falling like a king; and in the close  
 Which my last breath shall sound, thy name,  
     thou fairest,  
 Shall sing a requiem to my soul, unwilling  
 Only of greater glory 'cause divided  
 From such a heaven on earth as life with thee.  
(III.ii. 158-58)

Appropriately, Perkin concludes his "ceremony" by erecting a memorable tableau for them both where "love and majesty are reconciled" and where, apposite to his kingship, Katherine is to become the "empress of the west." (161-62)

Katherine reciprocates and substantiates his performance. Hearing Perkin, she comes to realize the importance of conduct lived out according to duty, fidelity, and love. (163-68) Her quiet recognition--"you must be king of me" (167)--is a restatement of Perkin's "empress of the west." In her new awareness of the role, the complementary image of Perkin as "king of hearts" is enforced. This is what Perkin

understands as her "beauteous virtue," and in this way, an ethical note is injected into "majesty and love." Appropriately, the masque is concluded by Katherine's stoic acceptance of destiny's workings: "What our destinies/ Have ruled out in their books we must not search,/ But kneel to." (180-82) The acceptance is not an expression of her conventional piety but, rather, a sign of her freedom to participate in the larger plot of life writ by Providence. What is required of her is that she play her role of life well. In Perkin and Katherine, then, du Vair's neo-stoic exhortation, "we play that parte well," is substantiated.

On the other hand, the masque introduces another important aspect of the theatrical ritualization of self by stressing its tragic nature. In the masque, this tragic note is suggested by Perkin's contemplation of the last moment of his life, foreshadowing the ultimate inability of the world to understand Perkin's kind of performance. This tragic tone is conspicuously developed in Act IV.ii, which shows the widening distance between Perkin and the world's inability to comprehend him. Throughout the scene, the tragic effect arises from the contrapuntal presentation of the world represented by the changed attitudes in James and Frion and the counterbalancing acts of Perkin and his "friends." Viewed in this way, the scene works as a theatrical tableau of trust. The tableau begins with Perkin's



lament over James' changed attitude. But his lament is, in effect, a lament over the world's insidious force which is capable of destroying the mutual bond of trust which James and Perkin have forged. (1-7) Characteristically, Perkin sees his script of life being crushed by James' betrayal of trust ("I feel the fabric/ Of my designs are tottering"). (7) But Perkin erects, out of James' diminishing trust, a self-reinforcing ceremony of resolution. (9-19) Frion, a political opportunist, cannot immediately see Perkin's ethical fervor and reprimands Perkin for growing "too wild in passion." (20) For Perkin's part, Frion's reservation about his performance ("If you will/ Appear a prince indeed") (20-21) is a reflection of Frion's equally diminishing trust in him:

What a saucy rudeness  
 Prompt this distrust! If? If I will appear?  
 Appear a prince? Death throttle such deceits  
 Even in their birth of utterance! cursed cozenage  
 Of trust!

(IV.ii. 22-26)

What appears to be Perkin's vehement "passion" is really his despair over another sign of disappearance of human trust. If his performance as a measure of ethical integrity cannot be trusted, then Perkin had better mock himself. In a curious gesture of self-denial, Perkin recreates an imaginary ceremony of deposition:

'Twere best, it seems,  
 That I should turn imposter to myself,  
 Be mine own counterfeit, belie the truth  
 Of my dear mother's womb, the sacred bed  
 Of a prince murdered and a living baffled.  
 (IV.ii. 26-30)

For Perkin, the enemy of trust seems to be "Gold and the promise of promotion" (33), but when Frion protests against such charges ("Why to me this?") (34), Perkin himself attempts to rebuild the trust between them ("your advice may piece again the heart/ Which many cares have broken"). (36-37) His restored trust in Frion, then, is emblematically enacted in a gesture of embrace and in an expression of his renewed hope for his life's "designs." (47-49) Fittingly, the tableau of trust is concluded with the display of continuing trust of Perkin's other "tried friends" who eagerly take up the landing on Cornwall. (50-97) The tableau of a complementary kind continues in Act IV.iv, which might be called the tableau of perseverance. The scene begins with James' final capitulation to Henry's enticements which force James to cast away Perkin from his court. The most enticing article thrown to James is a marriage proposal between him and Henry's daughter, Margaret. It is during the course of this marriage negotiation that the meaning of Perkin's identity is set up. When Hialas and Durham persuade James to accept Henry's marriage proposal, the marriage ceremony is appealed to as an efficacious

medium for creating and defining James' ideal self. (1-19) Just as Henry's political and sacred self was defined and consolidated by his marriage to Yorkist Elizabeth (I.i. 38-42), James' marriage to Margaret, they argue, will create a new James definable as a politically sagacious ruler.

Given this reading of the meaning of ceremony, particularly by his antagonists, Perkin's assumption of the ceremonial status of misrule together with his marriage to Katherine take on a more solid reality. The tableau of perseverance, which follows the exit of Durham and Hialas (62 onward), shows the now unbridgeable gap between the new James and Perkin. The tableau also underscores the ethical beauty of Perkin's being. James' dismissal of Perkin is clearly his unspoken admission of Durham's view of Perkin ("such a silly creature," "A shadow, a mere trifle"). (12-14) Conversely, Perkin converts James' denial of him into a more meaningful performance in which heroic action is made possible via the inner self. Without flying into "invectives" over James' betrayal (as he formerly did under different circumstances), he first vows to pursue "The fame of my designs" (87), expresses gratitude to James, and swears homage to him. (92-93) It is through such perseverance in his role that Perkin maintains his self-rule. His flawless performance suggests the deficiency in James' statecraft, which opts for the political advantages over the

more ethically satisfying values of trust, friendship, and love.

As if to reemphasize his values, Perkin requests James' reassurance on his marriage to Katherine. To Perkin, she is "such a great example/ Of virtue . . . Resolved on all extremes." (97-101) In fact, Katherine complements and completes the tableau's meaning by her avowal of fidelity: "I am your wife;/ No human power can or shall divorce/ My faith from duty." (102-4) Her avowal draws from James admiration ("unsuspected constancy"). (109) Constancy is synonymous with perseverance, and in keeping with the mutually enforcing ethical values, Katherine's role and identity are reaffirmed and substantiated. James resorts to the political marriage to support the traditional values. For Perkin and Katherine, their unchangeable selves are grounded in their willing participation in the pageantry of misrule. The final meaning of pageantry is restated in the perfect accord of love, and the shape and reality of pageantry are given by the marriage ceremony.

As if to enforce theatrical ceremonialization, the action takes on the shape and substance of a pageant. Thus, in Act IV.v, when Perkin lands on the coast of Cornwall, his arrival and the subsequent march to Exeter are figured as a pageant of progress by the "king of hearts." In this progress, Perkin and his followers become the central actors and

artificers of the theatre of self-governance, and Henry and his court become the supporting actors and spectators of that same theatre. Strikingly, it is Perkin who suggests the idea of his life: "These general acclamations are an omen/ Of happy process (i.e., progress) to their welcome lord." (7-8) As such, his progress is framed with the "wings of duty" for his subjects. (9) More particularly, it is framed with mutually complementary tableaux of "patience"--a form of self-governance over destiny--as if to reflect Perkin's virtuous inner life. Katherine's "Unequalled pattern of a matchless wife," Dalyell's "Rare unexampled pattern of a friend," and Jane's pattern of willing fidelity, all of them invest reality to Perkin's progress of the heart. (15-19) Katherine, Dalyell, and Jane view their roles as an expression of their self-acceptance via the truths of their hearts. Significantly, it is Jane, the least important of them, who gives credence to the ceremonialization of the heart's truth: "I wait but as the shadow to the body;/ For, madam, without you let me be nothing." (22-23) In effect, Perkin's followers are "the shadow" that gives Perkin's status "the body." But because the shadow is created by their self-initiated, self-determined role-playings, it is not an emblem of insubstantiality nor of unreality. Thus supported by his followers, Perkin is "king of hearts," as Skelton styles him. (32)

Perkin sets the progress in motion by striking up a summary tableau of self-governance and avows his continual adherence to the king's role by patiently and perseveringly pursuing the "beauty of the mind." (48-65) His final words--"Subjects are men on earth, kings men and gods"--are not only a restatement of his claim but also a kind of symbolic apotheosis of his ceremonial status, both as performer and artificer. What started out as a tale of political progress is now converted by the characters into a story of progress of the belief and power of the heart.

The progress reaches its climax in Act V.ii, in which the "antic pageantry" is enacted between Henry and Perkin. In Henry's political arena, Perkin and his friends are brought in like sacrificial scapegoats. But this is Perkin's time to assume ascendancy: his personality is in play, and his performance is in force. This observation is explicit in Daubeney's description of Perkin as a man changing from "a shadow/ Of majesty" to "in effect a substance/ Of pity." (32-34) To Daubeney, Perkin has become "the Christian world's strange wonder." (36) In short, Perkin has become the central actor and artificer of self-governance while the rest of the world are supporters and an audience to that rule. Henry brushes aside Daubeney's statement and proposes a counterstatement by restating Perkin's status as a saturnalian misrule who has parodied

majesty by promoting vice and disorder under the guise of rule:

Young man, upon thyself, and thy past actions,  
 What revels in combustion through our kingdom  
 A frenzy of aspiring youth hath danced,  
 Till, wanting breath, thy feet of pride have slipped  
 To break thy neck.

(V.ii. 49-53)

In Henry's eyes, Perkin appears like the figure of Vice in morality plays. In his response, however, Perkin shifts the emphasis away from simple moral terms. The issue in Perkin's hands is not whether his actions have been good or bad but, rather, whether he will be noble or degenerate in terms of his self-governance, whether his holiday status of misrule will become his permanent one. Moreover, his claim to the throne is not simply that of the Lord of Misrule but a more active, privately initiated self-creation. The connection between his theatrical self and his active self-reference is made when Perkin turns the tables by reminding Henry of how he himself had created his own kingship by availing himself of Richard III's waning fortunes. (58-65) By subtly blending the Yorkist version of history with a self-referential process, Perkin legitimizes his action as another example of human endeavors ("Fate, which crowned these attempts when less assured/ Might have befriended other like resolved"). (73-74) Henry may deride Perkin's performance as a reworking of verifiable historical facts

("The lesson, prompted, and well conned," "molded/ Into familiar dialogue, oft rehearsed,/ Till, learnt by heart, 'tis now received for truth"). (77-79) But Perkin's "truth" is something beyond the confines of raw historicity. His truth of "majesty"--the crux of his self and being--resides in the inward "Wisdom and gravity" of which his outward performance is a visible testimony. (80-87)

Despite his repeated denials, Henry is now unable to stem Perkin's spirit nor his performance. Conversely, Perkin displays his "own nature" by shifting attention from himself to his court and requests that Henry be charitable and show them clemency. (90-99) This is Perkin's noble act, which is equally reciprocated by A-Water, who perseveres in his own elected role. (104-11)

Following the show of Perkin's unalterable spirit and contained passion, Henry's treatment of Katherine then presents a strong contrast and acts like an anti-masque underscoring the disorderly anarchy of Henry's willful passion. His welcome ceremony for Katherine is appropriate to her station, but the ceremony is merely a disguise to conceal his naked desire to make her his mistress. Like Perkin, Henry considers himself a symbol of majesty and love (53-55), but Katherine quickly recognizes his intention, as her protest indicates ("O sir, I have a husband"). (155) In fact, her protest is not only her rejection of Henry's



dishonorable offer but also her reassertion of her ceremonial status of wife which Henry's passion attempts to change and destroy. While Henry knows how to use ceremony to his advantage, he is incapable of understanding what it really represents in a profound way.

This is why the final scene (Act V.iii) becomes a triumph for ceremony. Perkin's pageant misrule works, through the conscious control and mastery of his kingly role, to declare his self-rule, while the marriage ceremony validates "a strange truth" about him. The official view of Perkin is presented by the physical placement of Perkin in stocks like the scapegoat for the saturnalian ritual. This public humiliation is analogous to a carnival type of ceremony for the deposition of the Lord of Misrule. In Urswick's words, Perkin is a figure who presided over a brief revel but who, then tried in a lawful court and convicted of sins, is worthy of just punishment. (11-22) At this point Simnel, the erstwhile and now reformed impostor, comes forward and confronts Perkin with this crucial question: "You will not know who I am?" (32) Simnel's question refers to his past action in the simplistic moral terms of right and wrong ("a mere rascal," "all my villainies"). (40, 42) Moreover, he proceeds to define himself in terms of an earthly title ("I am now his falconer . . . sleep securely"). (45-47) He exhorts Perkin to emulate "my

example." (52) While Simnel acts from a political level, Perkin's contemptuous retort underscores his unbridgeable distance from Simnel. Perkin shows the insufficiency and incompleteness of Simnel's attempt at assuming a kingly role. Deeply rooted in Perkin's consciousness is this incontrovertible ceremonial assumption that "when you have to act, to be somebody, or become somebody, there is a moment when you have to have faith that the unknown beyond will respond to the names you commit yourself to as right names."<sup>18</sup> To Simnel, life is not a pageant, nor does his ceremonial role come to anything but the lowering of his spirit and the loss of self. (54-65) In Perkin's view, Simnel has indeed turned out to be a mock king ("Coarse creatures are incapable of excellence"). (70) Perkin, on the other hand, can call himself nobly, reordering the world as a theatre by the ceremonial magic of words and gestures. (71-76) Perkin's self-declamatory performance is not intended to show that he is just a misrule, just his role, or just a hyperbole. What at first seems to be burlesque and mockery of majesty becomes, in fact, Perkin's self-rule of du Vair's neo-stoic character. His attitude toward his being is grounded in a saturnalian reversal of values, and

---

<sup>18</sup> Barber, p. 210.

it goes beyond that to create and embody the meaning of his being out of a noble conceived role.

Katherine lends support to Perkin's performance by striking up a tableau of "Great miracle of constancy." (90) To Oxford's "Remember, lady, who you are; come from/ That impudent impostor" (112-13), Katherine asserts a culminating ceremonial conception of themselves:

You abuse us,  
For when the holy churchman joined our hands,  
Our vows were real then; the ceremony  
Was not in apparition, but in act.

(V.iii. 114-16)

This is her unequivocal knowledge, not of who she and Perkin may be but of what they are. The marriage ceremony has defined and eternalized their majestic identities as wife and husband. Like Perkin's performance of misrule, the marriage ceremony was not merely a formality but an "act," at once symbolic and real. If Perkin and Katherine are deluded, enchanted, and are dreamers, then they are the constructs (like actors) necessary to the ceremonial conception of life which insists on making the world a stage for the enactment of all ideal conducts.

This identity is enacted in the moving ceremony of parting that follows. For Perkin and Katherine, their indestructible affection is the final self-defining, self-memorializing factor, and from that affection all the other virtues--duty, truth, honor, majesty--flow. The ceremony

is visualized in a series of tableaux about constant affection. Perkin declares his sovereignty over their hearts ("We reign in our affections") (113) and embellishes this tableau of the heart with an enforcing tableau of her faith which supports his majesty ("one chaste wife's troth pure and uncorrupted," "Fair angel of perfection and immortality," "the calendar of virtue"). (128, 129, 132) This decree warrants Perkin's view of the world as a ceremonial stage. Katherine, too, converts a mere "entertainment" (138) into a more meaningful ceremony of rededication to their love. With a renewed exchange of marriage vows and kiss (139-54), Katherine reaffirms what she has insisted about the marriage ceremony before. (114-16)

It is Katherine's insistence about ceremony which causes Huntly to realize at last "thy constancy" (164) and which finally wins her his forgiveness and approval. It is true that Huntly formerly regarded their marriage as an illusory festive May game. Now, through Katherine's constancy, Huntly acknowledges the truth about them: Katherine is, in fact, "a wife and daughter," and Perkin is "your husband." (168-69) As a result, Huntly now regards Perkin's actions as "sufferance" and also tenders decorous respect to Perkin's "frailty,/ Which keeps so firm a station." (173-75) Indeed, the scene involving Perkin is a triumph for ceremony. Not only do ceremonial performances bring to

order and contain otherwise chaotic emotions and desires, but they are the emblems of the characters' inward "line of life," an ideal code of conduct.

It is fitting, therefore, that Perkin makes the last, triumphant tribute to his ceremonial self. The last address to his followers is, in effect, a culminating ceremony of enthronement to which the long pageant of progress has led them: "I read/ A triumph over tyranny upon/ Their several foreheads," "Innocent Warwick's head--for we are prologue/ But to his tragedy--conclude the wonder/ Of Henry's fears."

(188-94) This perseverance in his ceremonial role once more underscores his ability to accept the responsibility for his conduct as well as his ability to fuse role-playing with life. His sense of triumph is repeated in his appeal to nature and time:

heaven be obeyed.  
Impoverish time of its amazement, friends,  
And we will prove as trusty in our payments  
As prodigal to nature in our deaths.  
(V.iii. 196-99)

More specifically, his triumph over nature and time finds courage and resolution through a transcendence, a renunciation of death as a kind of fiction: "Death? Pish, 'tis but a sound, a name of air,/ A minute's storm, or not so much." (200-201) Perkin's characteristic tendency towards self-creation, then, insists that the eternal victory is his over death and that his final rule is to proclaim to the

melancholy theatre of the world: "Be men of spirit;/ Spurn coward passion! So illustrious mention/ Shall blaze our names, and style us kings o'er death." (206-8) In this final scene, Perkin is addressing not only his immediate audience but all of us from the heights of his imagination, and questions our own belief in him. As we watch Perkin walk to the gallows, we are indeed made to feel he has actually transformed ceremony into an important measure for gauging reality. In Henry's view, Perkin may remain an "impostor beyond precedent" (208), and his execution is a symbol for the purging of evil and corrupted blood.

(218-20) In short, the saturnalian Lord of Misrule is transformed into a festive sacrifice. On the other hand, we have seen that Perkin had committed his conduct and thought into ceremonial patterns in order to clarify that ceremony has ethical and artistic efficacy. In fact, it is only when we realize Perkin's last posture as the triumph of his imagination that we can appreciate the subtitle, "a strange truth." Understanding Perkin as a product of imagination, then, we can see his imposture as his heart's radical gesture, his strange truth as our own wistful, secret wish that Perkin be real.

## CHAPTER IX

### SOME CONCLUSIONS

Ford's ceremonial theatre pits his characters' private passions against the prevailing social order. It is a theatre where the powerful emotions of the protagonists distinguish them from other men. The manner of this distinction is constantly marked by ceremonials (for instance, by pageants, ritual tableaux, declamations, dances, trials, masques, or role-playing, either singly or in combination). The characters self-consciously turn their backs on the accepted social order, in order to live their own "line of life," which is more apt to be an inflexible, emotional style. In the consciousness of Ford's characters, the ceremonial mode of self-expression embodies their emotional truths and certifies the ethical claims of those truths. Ford's use of ceremony seems to underscore man's potential ability to design his self-revealing rituals. Because such rituals are rooted in strong, subjective emotions, they supply the characters' images of themselves, and help define the objective truths in which the singlemindedness of their ceremonial performance can be impressed.

Ford's characters are under pressure from potentially destructive passions, but they achieve a distance from those passions when they enact them in a visible, ceremonial form. What counts for them is the moment which imitates the vitality and immediacy of a passionate experience. If their destinies are inscrutable and the world is a melancholy place, the characters are still capable of feeling the fullness and the rich, symbolic intimations of living out the vital experiences presented to them. Nowhere is this assertion more apparent than in the endings of the plays I have reviewed. When Palador orders the "solemn rites" of the marriage ceremony to be performed, he is alive to the celebration of life that the marriage ceremony promises. Calantha dies decorously, passing on the legacy of the state of Nearchus, and is concerned to the end with being an example of the code of the proper conduct. Giovanni takes his death as the final act of ritualistic declamation, by exerting his vitality to the full, even though it is self-defeating. The duke's self-sacrifice is his own voluntary testament of the painful costs he has paid in order to gain insight into and knowledge about true love and honor. In the final reaffirmation of himself as the Lord of Misrule, Perkin is more alive to his imaginative self than anyone else in the play, and he leaves us with a sense of loss and regret which the



cold, calculating Henry cannot replace. Despite what they may have fractured, lost, or destroyed in the course of their career, the fulfillment of life is the characters' immersion in the moment, their direct engagement with significant emotional experiences.

This sense of immediacy is reenforced by whatever emotional connection with the true self the characters achieve through different ceremonies. Ceremonies can show that vital connection, because in it the true self has found heightened, representational analogies which are infused with the concerns of Ford's characters. In his command that the marriage ceremony be performed, Palador's melancholy spirit is healed and comes to terms with society's order and harmony. In the knowledge of her irrevocable loss of Itholces, Calantha shows her best self, by performing a state ceremony which represents the final example for the need of restraint and moderation in the face of chaotic experiences. In the culminating anti-ceremony of Giovanni's egoism, other characters must learn to see the falsity and deception that the human heart is prone to portray. In Love's Sacrifice, the rites of self-sacrifice become symbolic acts which embody knowledge of social honor and constant affection. Similarly, in Perkin Warbeck, Perkin's self-ceremonialization as the Lord of Misrule becomes a social action which emphasizes the importance of self-rule.

The characters adopt various ceremonial forms, because the tangible, physical nature of a ceremony brings out a renewed, almost luminous sense of their true selves. From Corax's Masque of Melancholy to Palador's Masque of Union and to the marriage ceremony, The Lover's Melancholy shows that ceremonies allow the characters to get in touch with their orderly and harmonious selves. In the mock coronation ceremony, Ithocles learns how to be truly honorable, and Calantha's public ceremony after his death allows her to carry herself through the reality of her private grief, and discharges the depth of her inner feelings. A series of Giovanni's spurious counter-ceremonies mark his idealization of incestuous passion which shows the truth of his irredeemable self. From the marriage ceremony to the trial ritual and to the rites of sacrifice, the ceremonies in Love's Sacrifice define what one's true self should hold as real love and honor. Most impressive, perhaps, is the sense of the true self in Perkin Warbeck. Henry denies Perkin's true self, by calling him a shadowy counterfeit in the "antic pageantry." But, Henry's denial achieves a compelling tangibility in Perkin's incomparable self-enactment in his vision of life as the pageantry of self-rule.

One of the the strongest characteristics of Ford's plays is his understanding of the passionate nature of man,

and of the meanings such emotional nature invokes. Ford interprets every moment of passionate experience as pregnant, significant, and full of formal possibilities. In varying degrees, Ford's characters conduct themselves as if they knew that to be alive is to be passionate, and to be meaningfully attuned to their deeply-felt experiences. If the various ceremonies are able to embody and formalize experiences of values which lift men above the confines of their mundane selves, then the passionate and symbolic experiences of life return in Ford's plays with an emotional intimacy and stylistic elegance that lie in the heart of the ceremonies.

Ford's ceremonial theatre, then, consists of the physical enactments of man's emotional life. It exists as a persuasive collection of Ford's cherished ethical ideals he contemplates for man. Ford favors dramatic stylizations which have a strong visual, ceremonial structure for the elegant portrayal of the urgent, emotional attitudes of his characters. Why does Ford use ceremony as a medium which yokes stylistic cultivation and emotional imperatives? What value is there in this kind of formalism, and how does Ford's ceremony-oriented style relate to his contemporary theatrical ethos? On one hand, Ford's technique appears a little orthodox and conventional in his continual attention to tokens and rituals of human behavior. Because Ford's

character delineation relies upon his understanding of symbols via ceremonies, his plays seem to regress toward those times when liturgical dramas, folk plays, or morality plays were prevalent. Like those dramatic forms, a great deal of Ford's symbolic and ceremonial representation of characters is intended to imply not so much a realistic rendering as an ordered description of thought and feeling. On the other hand, Ford's plays share distinct characteristics of the late Jacobean and Caroline theatrical milieu. Particularly, Ford's extravagant romantic plots, his focus on man's passionate nature, and the elevations of emotions as a vehicle of expressing ethical concerns doubtlessly reflect the tastes of an upper-class coterie of the Caroline private theatres for which Ford wrote.<sup>1</sup> Ford's emotive plots aim to stir in the audience equally strong emotional reactions, and these supply a source of theatrical experience in its own right. The pity and delight which are promised the audience of The Broken Heart and The Lady's Trial evidently delighted his audience.

More importantly, Ford's emotion-filled plots appear

---

<sup>1</sup>For some of the negative views on the tastes of the Caroline private theatres, see: W. A. Armstrong, "The Audiences of the Elizabethan Private Theatre, 1575-1642," RES n. s., 10 (1959): 234-249; A. Gurr, The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970); A. Harbage, Cavalier Drama (New York: Russell & Russell, 1936); C. Leach, "The Caroline Audience", MLR, 31 (1941): 304-319.

to have been deliberately conceived to show his bravura talent as much in devising the plot's direction as in selecting his narrative ornaments. The highly emotional content of each play becomes not only a matter of Ford's creating and controlling his characters' passionate nature; it becomes a matter of organizing a character's passionate life, which anticipates the final meaning of each play. What Ford has created is a formal conceit which is dramatic and dynamic: ceremony's way of formalizing man's passionate, yet meaningful experience characterizes, perhaps dictates, the motion and meaning of the dramatic incidents. Ford restricts the material which depicts man's passionate experiences. Instead of dealing overtly with larger moral and political issues, Ford mainly confines his material within man's experience of love and marriage as the legitimately intellectual, as well as ethical, concern. What his romantic plots reveal is simply one aspect of man's universal experience in which high emotions are evoked. This shows itself in Ford's persistent fascination with the betrothal and marriage ceremony (what might be called an emotional background for the characters' ethical action), and in his marked technical preference for the various forms of ceremony. Along with Donne and Herbert, Caroline dramatists from Shirley to Davenant would have recognized such ingenious application of ceremony to the larger

construction of a play as conceit, wit, fancy, invention, or imagination. Consisting of far more than mere verbal facility, such as "witty epigrammatic expression,"<sup>2</sup> Ford's conceit, like his contemporaries', is an epitome of his literary talent. It appears in the construction and disposition of an ingeniously-woven romantic plot. It also appears in his plays' imaginative structure, where high emotions are transformed into something intellectually and ethically significant through the yoking of language, acting and ceremonial stagecraft.<sup>3</sup>

When I view Ford's ceremonial theatre as a type of theatre of conceit, then I may be able to give his remaining plays, The Lady's Trial and The Fancies, Chaste and Noble, a better critical understanding than they are normally accorded. It is particularly appropriate to examine these plays under the aspect of conceit, for the word "conceit" and its cognates appear insistently in the prologue of each

---

<sup>2</sup>T. M. Parrott and R. H. Bull, A Short View of Elizabethan Drama (New York: Scribner's, 1943), p. 250.

<sup>3</sup>For sympathetic views of the achievements of the Caroline dramatists, see M. Neill's "'Wits most accomplished Senate': The Audience of the Caroline Private Theatres," Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 18 (1978): 341-360. For discussion of the importance of style as total structure, see C. Hoy, "Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style," Shakespeare Survey, 26 (1973): 49-67. Though it does not directly discuss the Caroline theatre, Hoy's work is relevant as it contains many useful suggestions regarding Jacobean dramatists' attempts to combine high emotions with formal means.

play. Indeed, I can notice, in each play, Ford's characteristic combination of ethical concern with form which is carried in such terms as conceit, fancy, wit, invention, or imagination.

The Lady's Trial offers a variation on the theme Ford treated in Love's Sacrifice: how can a husband and wife maintain the unchanging honor and love which their marriage ceremony is supposed to proclaim? Ford has described this theme with rather pessimistic notes in Love's Sacrifice. The formal convention of the marriage vows and rite does not necessarily guarantee the continuation of perfect love and honor, and occasionally people find such love outside marriage. Also, sometimes in order to maintain true love and honor, people have to undergo much tragic sacrifice. In order to carry out these thematic implications, Ford has employed the ceremony of self-sacrifice as a kind of unifying conceit, and has built the play's structure according to a series of corresponding self-memorializing ceremonial devices. In The Lady's Trial, the plot - the first ceremonial thread - is constructed so as to demonstrate the theme that true love and honor are maintained through various trials. The marriage of Auria and Spinella is a publicly acknowledged fact, but in order to uphold successfully the imperatives of the marriage rite, they must overcome various obstacles. An impoverished

Auria blamelessly submits innocent Spinella to a testing indirectly by going off to war to regain his lost fortune. He leaves her in the care of Aurelio, his friend, who in turn considers Auria's decision unwise and warns him of possible dishonorable consequences. Aurelio's fears are realized, when Adurni tries Spinella's honor by attempting to seduce her at a private banquet. Aurelio sees and intercedes, but judges Spinella and Adurni guilty of adultery on superficial evidence. Auria returns and he himself takes the sticky situation in hand. He solves the problem with a staged trial scene in which all characters are brought to judgment: Spinella proves herself innocent of adultery, Adurni and Aurelio are scolded for "traducing spotless honor,"<sup>4</sup> and the rest are warned of "over-busy curiosity." The end is order and harmony, and the love and honor between Auria and Spinella emerge enhanced by this trial.

The play's final meaning and its formal conceit are most visible in Act IV.ii in which Spinella is on trial. While Adurni testifies to Spinella's innocence, Malfato sets the formal tone: "state and ceremony/ Inhabit here." Malfato's words summarize Ford's second ceremonial thread -

---

<sup>4</sup>The lines from The Lady's Trial and The Fancies Chaste and Noble are from the Gifford-Dyce edition of the plays, volume III, pp. 219-322, and volume II, pp. 1-99, respectively.



his narrative details. The play's crucial scenes are animated with a measured series of the ceremonies of trial. First, the language reenforces the idea of love as trial in various ways. It appears as purely legal terms: client, evidence, verdict, lawyer, judgment, judge, jury, court. At other times, it appears in a strongly quasi-religious context connoting ecclesiastic inquisition: blame, correct, council, discretion, fault, frailty, holy signature, purge, obedience, punishment, reproof, truth, trespass. The meanings of these verbal stratagems, however, are further enhanced by the ceremonial scenes of the trial in which different characters assume roles necessary to the legal proceedings. Auria's testing of Spinella (V.ii) is the most persuasive example, with Auria acting as judge, and Spinella becoming the accused. But other scenes fit into this basic pattern. Adurni's seduction of Spinella (II.iv) ends with a semi-ecclesiastic court scene, when Aurelio enters. Aurelio immediately assumes the role of omnipotent judge, while Spinella is the irredeemable sinner:

Horror,  
 Becoming such a forfeit of obedience;  
 Hope not that any falsity in friendship  
 Can palliate a broken faith; it dares not.  
 Leave in thy prayers, fair, vow-breaking wanton,  
 To dress thy soul anew, whose purer whiteness  
 Is sullied by thy change from truth to folly.  
 A fearful storm is hovering; it will fall;  
 No shelter can avoid it: let the guilty  
 Sink under their own ruin.

In the sub-plot as well, trial scenes are employed to test true love and honor. In Act II.ii in which otherwise virtuous Levidolche is accused of adultery with Adurni and Malfato, her uncle Martino speaks as if he were judge as much as Aurelio is to Spinella: "Sit in commission on your own defects;/ Accuse yourself; be your own jury, judge,/ And executioner."

The cumulative effect of such scenes is Ford's adroit mixing of emotions with the conceit of a ceremonial trial. The play which puts the characters in testing situations involves society's codes of honor, love, revenge, and friendship. Such codes tend to encourage strong passions, misunderstandings and misjudgments. But by framing emotional situations within the ceremonies of trial, Ford points toward the possibility of rational resolutions to otherwise chaotic emotional relationships. Rational resolutions are possible, when the characters are willing to submit themselves to the formality of trial proceedings. Ford exalts man's rational behavior as a clear sign of true love and honor. At the same time, he constructs a structural conceit of trial governing emotional and the motion of events. Ford's conceit is not a witty personal satire, as Bird attempts to clarify in the play's prologue ("Wit, wit's the word in fashion, that alone/ Cries up the poet, which, though neatly shown,/ Is rather censur'd, oftentimes,

than Known"). Rather it figures as the composition of the play as a whole. To restate Bird's words in the prologue, Ford's conceit appears as a plot and narrative of the whole play, itself an attempt to unite appropriate "language and matter." Ceremonies of trial control the pattern of events. At the same time, ceremonies of trial in turn contribute to the total metaphor of love as a trial and illuminates the play's expression of the theme.

In a minor key, The Fancies, Chaste and Noble repeats the formal conceit of The Lady's Trial. Like The Lady's Trial, the play takes up the trial of Castamela as its central conceit and illuminates her trial as a kind of moral education: how she achieves a correct understanding of love, and how, in the process, she learns its relation with regard to the world of appearance (i.e. social rank, wealth and marriage). The first ceremonial thread, then, develops the nature of love in terms of the Platonic terminology, and explores the title's "chaste and noble" love which is preparatory to the marriage ceremony. During this exploration, Ford scrutinizes the human tendency to misjudge the appearance of things (which the nature of love represents) and the virtues of trial in order to correct such tendencies. Castamela's trial begins, when Troylo-Savelli, nephew of the Marquis Octavio, persuades Livio, her brother, to place her in an establishment of the three

young women, maintained by Octavio, and called the Bower of Fancies. Troylo and Octavio use preferment as a means of persuasion, though Livio is unaware that his own friendship and love are on trial. Livio, while he suspects that he is selling Castamela's honor for his own advancement, eventually gives his consent so that Castamela can join the Bower. When Troylo assures Livio that Octavio is impotent, and only delights in a Platonic relationship with the young women, Livio's misgivings about castamela's honor are somewhat allayed. Livio in turn assures castamela of the innocent nature of the Bower ("I would not hazard/ My hopes, my joys of thee on dangerous trial . . . 'tis but a pastime smil'd at/ Amongst your selves in counsel" I.iii).

Castamela agrees to join the Bower, though she is not as assured of the Bower as Livio. The degraded Platonic language of love, with which Morosa, a servant to Octavio, reassures her, compounds her misgivings. Thus, when Octavio later approaches Castamela as a Platonic lover, she instantly mistakes him as a carnal seducer, and misinterprets Octavio's Platonic motto of love as a potential seducer's guile ("Love, dear maid,/ Is but desire of beauty, and 'tis proper/ For beauty to desire to be beloved" III.ii). As her stay at the Bower continues, however, Castamela comes to realize the truth of the situation. She even learns to appreciate the spiritual

quality of the Platonic love which Octavio upholds and with which the three young women are united ("and sufferance/ Of former trials too strongly armed me" IV.i). In the meantime, Livio again feels that he has sacrificed Castamela for his ambition. He decides to take her away from the Bower and to marry her to Romanello, who is an impoverished but respectable suitor. Castamela, who is equipped with knowledge of the true situation of the Bower, rejects Romanello and insists upon staying at the Bower. Romanello, seeing the changes in Castamela, concludes that she has become a whore, and he too rejects Livio's offer of marriage.

Now, various scandalous rumours, promoted chiefly by the servants, become rife about the Bower. The integrity of Octavio and Castamela are placed in doubt. Thus, Livio, believing himself betrayed, challenges Troylo to a duel. But his avenging wrath vanishes when the true situation is revealed. The Bower of Fancies, far from being Octavio's seraglio, is in fact an "academy," a kind of finishing school which he maintains for the practice of Platonic love and for the benefit of his three nieces. Castamela's stay at the Bower has been a part of Troylo's trial whereby she has to learn of chaste and noble love and honor preparatory to marrying Troylo; and the trial of Livio too has been an education of chaste and noble love

and friendship in anticipation of his marriage to one of the Fancies.

The play deals with the true understanding of love necessary for the marriage ceremony, and concludes that true love and honor are chaste and noble, as embodied in Platonic Octavio and the three Fancies. But even a person of Octavio's and Fancies' qualities may be condemned because of the human tendency to misjudge truth and to invent fiction. Love encourages too much wrong passion which transforms the truth of Octavio's Platonic love into a fiction of base carnality. The appropriate processes of trial, then, may provide the right education. They formalize the way of finding the truth and force the characters into testing situations where right knowledge modifies their conceptions of love. These processes therefore resolve the disparity between the reality and the appearance of the general scheme of things. In the play world, the processes of trial restore harmony to human relationships, and preserve love and honor in the proper estimation.

The narrative details support these thematic thrusts. Because the play takes the mystic theology of Platonism quite seriously, the characters' trials are associated with the spiritual trials of the soul, with characters assuming the alternating roles of the tempter and the tempted. As a result, the crucial scenes of the trial are characterized

predominately by vocabularies suggestive of religious analogies. One of the representative trial scenes occurs in Act III.iii in which the otherwise well-meaning Octavio becomes the tempter of Castamela's soul. She thoroughly misinterprets Octavio's Platonic language of love, and upbraids him for the arch-devil that he seems to be acting:

No worse you dare not to imagine  
 Where such an awful innocency as mine is  
 Outfaces every wickedness your dotage  
 Has lull'd you in. I scent your cruel mercies;  
 Your fact'ress hath been tampering for my misery,  
 Your old temptation, your she-devil.

Even purely legal terms and phrases, echoing those in The Lady's Trial, often emphasize the differences between what the characters understand of Octavio's Platonism and what they come to know of its true meanings.

The play has been criticized for its alleged prurency and use of titillating material. Perhaps one of the reasons for such negative criticism is that critics have dismissed the debates on the niceties of Platonic love and honor as sentimentality and sensationalism. In part Ford is responsible for such attack. Having written 'Tis Pity She's a Whole in which he uses Platonic love with acute irony, Ford may be questioned about his sincerity in retreating Platonism seriously in this play. For a related reason, such negative criticism may stem from the fact that the title's word, fancies, has not been properly understood.

O.E.D. lists extant meanings of the word in Ford's days as: "amorous inclination, love"; "a supposition resting on no solid grounds, an arbitrary notion"; and "something that pleases and entertains." What Ford has achieved is a creation of conceit by integrating these meanings into thematic motion and narrative details. By elevating "amorous inclination, love" to the status of Platonic love, Ford examines man's propensity to "arbitrary notion" regarding what he supposes the true nature of love to be. In order to clarify this, he sets up the metaphor of ceremonial trial as a demonstration of his talent which, he hopes, "pleases and entertains." The prologue emphasizes this particular point: "His free invention runs but in conceit/ Of mere imagination; there's the height/ Of what he writes." Viewed in this way, the play deserves more careful reading of its theme and form. Though the play, together with The Lady's Trial, is considered Ford's lesser work, it seems to reflect his basic commitment to ethical idealism and to the expressive adequacy of ceremonies which he has realized on a grander scale in his major plays.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>For explications of the last two plays, see J. Howe, "Ford's The Lady's Trial A Play of Metaphysical Wit," Genre, 7 (1974): 342-361, and J. Sutton, "Platonic Love in Ford's The Fancies, Chaste and Noble," Studies in English Literature, 7 (1967): 299-309. Their opinions are more sympathetic towards Ford's achievements in those plays, and differ from negative views commonly held by critics. Their interests are mainly in thematic explanations, but I share



My study has been an exploration of ceremony and its relation to Ford's five major plays. By drawing analogies between ceremony and drama, my purpose has been to try to isolate some of the features which Ford's drama shares with the form of ceremony. I have also tried to discover ceremony as a means to dramatic cohesiveness, an unexplored moral and formal pattern, and I have attempted to interpret Ford's ethical and theatrical temperament. In conclusion, my view of Ford, the dramatist, may be stated in the following manner. Ford presents his response to the condition of man and the world, following Robert Burton as his philosophic mentor. Just as the writing of The Anatomy of Melancholy becomes a cure for Burton's melancholy temperament, so does the composing of plays appear to temper Ford's simultaneously sombre and eloquent temperament. Ford writes about ideas and feelings which safeguard him against his nightmare visions of the change and flux of human condition. And Ford arranges such ideas and feelings as his intense responsiveness not only to his world view, but also to theatrically imagined reality. The essential self is, for Ford, that of an artificer who explores the power of imagination as a faculty of total recreation. Ford appeals to dramatic worlds to give him a feeling of the substan-

---

some of their interpretations, which I have incorporated in my ceremonial approach.

tiality of that imagined reality as something pleasurably vivid, fresh, and valuable. The final virtue of Ford's ceremonial theatre is a heightened sense of the physical presence of his imagination creation. The simplest and most conventional details of his language and stagecraft achieve a pregnancy, a lucidity, and a renewed sense of life which his staged ceremonies ultimately celebrate.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Bacon, Francis. The History of the Reign of King Henry the Seventh. Edited by F. J. Levy. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1972.
- Burton, Robert. The Anatomy of Melancholy. Edited by F. Dell and P. Jordan-Smith. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1927.
- Davenant, William. Love and Honor and The Siege of Rhodes. Edited by J. W. Tupper. Boston and London: D. D. Heath & Company, 1909.
- du Vair, Guillaume. The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks. Translated by Thomas James, 1598, and edited with introduction and notes by Rudolf Kirk. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1951.
- Ford, John. A Critical Edition of Ford's Perkin Warbeck. Edited by Mildred Clara Struble. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Drama in the English Renaissance II: The Stuart Period. Edited by R. A. Fraser and M. Rabkin. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. John Ford, Three Plays. Edited by Havelock Ellis. New York: Hill and Wang, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. John Fordes Dramatische Werke. Edited by W. Bang. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Broken Heart. Edited by D. K. Anderson, Jr. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Broken Heart. Edited by B. Morris. London: E. Benn, 1965.

Ford, John. The Chronicle History of Perkin Warbeck: A Strange Truth. Edited by Peter Ure. London: Methuen 1968.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Works of John Ford. Edited by William Gifford, with additions by the Reverend Alexander Dyce. 3 volumes. London: James Toovey, 1869 and 1895.

Herbert, George. The Works of George Herbert. Edited by F. E. Hutchinson. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1941.

Hooker, Richard. The Folger Library Edition of the Works of Richard Hooker. Edited by W. S. Hill. 2 volumes. Cambridge, MA and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977.

Johnson, Ben. The Complete Masques. Edited by Stephen Orgel. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1969.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. The Prince. Translated, edited, with an introduction by Daniel Donno. New York: Bantam Books, 1966.

Marlowe, Christopher, and Chapman, George. Hero and Leander: Begun by Christopher Marloe: and finished by George Chapman. Scholar Press Facsimiles Series. London: The Scholar Press, Limited, 1973.

Morton, Thomas. A Defense of the Innocencie of the Three Ceremonies of the Church of England. Text made by University Microfilm, No. 18179.

Prynne, William. Histrion-Mastix. London: Printed by E. A. and W. I. for Michael Sparke, 1633.

Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie. Edited by Hilton Landry. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1970.

Shakespeare, William. The Complete Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. A new text edited with introduction and notes by William A. Neilson and Charles J. Hill. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1942.

Shirley, James. The Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley. Edited by William Gifford, with additions by the Reverend Alexander Dyce. 6 volumes. London: John Murray, 1833.

Stubbes, Phillip. The Anatomie of Abuses. Edited with a preface for the Garland edition by Arthur Freeman. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1973.

## II. SECONDARY SOURCES

Anderson, D. K. Jr. John Ford. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Kingship in Ford's Perkin Warbeck." Journal of English Literary History, 28 (1960): 177-193.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Heart and the Banquet: Imagery in Ford's 'Tis Pity She's a Whore and The Broken Heart." Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 2 (1962): 209-217.

Armstrong, W. A. "The Audience of the Elizabethan Private Theatres, 1575-1642." Review of English Studies, n. s. 10 (1959): 234-249.

Bacon, Wallace A. "The Literary Reputation of John Ford." Huntington Library Quarterly, 11 (1947-8): 181-199.

Barber, C. L. Shakespeare's Festive Comedy. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1963.

Barish, Jonas. "Perkin Warbeck as Anti-History." Essays in Criticism, 20 (1970): 151-171.

Bentley, Gerald E. The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. 7 volumes. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1968.

Bergeron, David M. English Civic Pageantry 1558-1642. Columbia, S. Carolina: University of S. Carolina Press, 1971.

Bernheimer, Richard. "Theatrum Mundi." The Art Bulletin, 38 (1956): 225-247.

- Bethel, S. L. The Cultural Revolution of the Seventeenth Century. London: Dennis Dobson, 1951
- Blayney, Glenn H. "Convention, Plot and Structure in The Broken Heart." Modern Philology, 56 (1958): 1-9.
- Boas, F. S. An Introduction to Stuart Drama. London: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Bose, Tirthanka. "Ford's Understanding of Honour." Literary Criticism, 4 (1969): 19-26.
- Bradbrook, M. C. Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1952.
- Brand, John. Observations on the Popular Antiquities of Great Britain. New York: AMS Press, 1848.
- Brissenden, Alan. "Impediments to Love: A Theme in John Ford." Renaissance Drama, 7 (1964): 95-102.
- Brooke, Nicholas. "The Tragic Spectacle in Titus Andronicus and Romeo and Juliet." Shakespeare: A Collection of Critical Essays. Edited by Clifford Leech. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Camden, Carrol. The Elizabethan Woman. New York: Paul F. Appel, 1975.
- Chambers, E. K. The Medieval Stage. 2 volumes. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Champion, Larry S. The Tragic Patterns in Jacobean and Caroline Drama. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1977.
- Chang, Joseph. "Of Mighty Opposites: Stoicism and Machiavellianism." Renaissance Drama, 9 (1966): 37-57.
- Cohen, Eileen Z. "The Visible Solemnity: Ceremony and Order in Shakespeare and Hooker." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 12 (1970): 181-195.
- Cox, Harvey. The Feast of Fools. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

- Cuming, G. J. A History of Anglican Liturgy. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1969.
- Danby, J. F. Shakespeare's Doctrine of Nature. London: Faber and Faber, 1949.
- Davril, Robert E. Le Drame de John Ford. Paris: Didier, 1954.
- Diehl, H. "Iconography and Characterization in English Tragedy, 1585-1642." Comparative Drama, 12 (1978): 113-122.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. London: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Doran, Madeleine. Endeavors of Art. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954.
- Edelstein, Ludwig. The Meaning of Stoicism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Edward, Philip. "The Royal Pretenders in Massinger and Ford." Essays and Studies, 59 (1974): 18-36.
- Ellis-Fermor, Una. The Jacobean Drama. London: Methuen, 1958.
- Eusden, John D. Puritans, Lawyers and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
- Ewing, S. Blaine. Burtonian Melancholy in the Plays of John Ford. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
- Farnham, Willard. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1936.
- Farr, Dorothy. John Ford and the Caroline Theatre. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1972.
- Fletcher, J. B. The Religion of Beauty in Woman and Other Essays on Platonic Love in Poetry and Society. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1911.

- Fraser, Russell. "Elizabethan Drama and the Art of Abstraction." Comparative Drama, 2 (1968): 73-82.
- Freeman, Rosemary. English Emblem Books. London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1948.
- Frost, David L. School of Shakespeare. Cambridge: The University Press, 1968.
- Frost, William. "Shakespeare's Rituals and the Opening of King Lear." Shakespeare: A Collection of Critical Essays. Edited with an introduction by Clifford Leech. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Frye, Northrop. A Natural Perspective. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Gairdner, James. Henry the Seventh. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1926.
- Gardiner, S. R. History of England. 10 volumes. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1883-1884.
- Gent, Lucy. "'Venus and Adonis': The Triumph of Rhetoric." Modern Language Review, 69 (1974): 721-729.
- Gilbert, Allan H. The Symbolic Persons in the Masques of Ben Jonson. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1948.
- Gombrich, E. H. Art and Illusion. New York: Pantheon Books, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Icones Symbolicae: The Visual Image in Neo-Platonic Thought." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 11 (1948): 163-192.
- Gordon, D. J. "Chapman's Hero and Leander." English Miscellany, 5 (1954): 41-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Hymenaei: Ben Jonson's Masque of Union." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 8 (1945): 106-145.



- Gordon, D. J. "Poet and Architect; The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 12 (1949): 152-178.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Imagery of Ben Jonson's The Masque of Blackness and The Masque of Beautie." Journal of The Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 6 (1943): 122-141.
- Grierson, Herbert J. Cross-Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century. London: Chatto & Windus, 1929.
- Griffin, Alice. Pageantry on the Shakespearean Stage. New Haven: College and Union Press, 1951.
- Gurr, Andrew. The Shakespearean Stage. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970.
- Harbage, Alfred. Cavalier Drama. New York: Russell & Russell, 1964.
- Harding, D. P. "Elizabethan Betrothals and 'Measure and Measure.'" JEGP, 49 (1950): 139-158.
- Hardison, O. B., Jr. Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.
- Harrison, D. E. W. Common Prayer in the Church of England. London: S.P.C.K., 1969.
- Harrison, J. E. Ancient Art and Ritual. New York: H. Holt & Co., 1913.
- Haydn, H. The Counter-Renaissance. New York: Scribners, 1950.
- Hazard, Mary E. "An Essay to Amplify 'Ornament': Some Renaissance Theory and Practice." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 16 (1976): 15-32.
- Hazlitt, W. Carew. Faiths and Folklore of the British Isles. 2 volumes. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1965.

- Heckscher, William S. "Renaissance Emblems: Observations Suggested by Some Emblem-Books in the Princeton University Library." Princeton University Library Chronicle, 15 (1953): 55-68.
- Heinemann, Margot. Puritanism and Theatre. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Hogan, A. P. "'Tis Pity She's a Whore: The Overall Design." Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 17 (1977): 302-316.
- Howe, James. "Ford's The Lady's Trial: A Play of Metaphysical Wit." Genre, 7 (1974): 342-361.
- Hoy, C. "Jacobean Tragedy and the Mannerist Style." Shakespeare Survey, 26 (1973): 49-67.
- Huebert, Ronald. "'An Artificial Way to Grieve': The Forsaken Woman in Beaumont and Fletcher, Massinger and Ford." English Literary History, 44 (1977): 601-621.
- Huizinga, John. Homo Ludens. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
- Ingram, R. W. "Patterns of Music and Action in Fletcherian Drama." Music in English Renaissance Drama. Edited by John H. Long. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.
- Joseph, B. L. Elizabethan Acting. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst H. The King's Two Bodies. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Kaufmann, R. J. "Ford's Tragic Perspective." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 1 (1960): 522-537.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ford's Waste Land: The Broken Heart." Renaissance Drama n. s., 3 (1970): 167-187.
- Kelso, Ruth. Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century. Gloucester, MA: P. Smith, 1964.

Kernodle, George R. From Art to Theatre. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Renaissance Artists in the Service of the People: Political Tableaux and Street Theatres in France, Flanders, and England." The Art Bulletin, 25, (1943): 59-64.

Kirby, E. W. William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Kirsch, A. C. Jacobean Dramatic Perspective. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972.

Lanham, Richard. The Motives of Eloquence. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976.

Lauren, Barbara. "John Ford: A Caroline Alternative to Beaumont and Fletcher." Modern Language Studies, 5 (1974): 53-66.

Leech, Clifford. John Ford. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. John Ford and the Drama of His Time. London: Chatto & Windus, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Caroline Audience." Modern Language Review, 31 (1941): 304-319.

McAdoo, Henry R. The Spirit of Anglicanism. London: Adam & Charles Black, c. 1965.

McDonald, Charles O. "The Design of John Ford's 'The Broken Heart': A Study in the Development of Caroline Sensibility." Studies in Philology, 59 (1962): 141-161.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Rhetoric of Tragedy. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1966.

McGrade, Arthur S. "The Public and Religious in Hooker's Polity." Church History, 37 (1968): 404-422.

- McMaster, Juliet. "Love, Lust and Sham: Structural Pattern in the Plays of John Ford." Renaissance Drama, 2 (1969): 157-166.
- Manly, John M. "Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species." Modern Philology, 4 (1906-7): 576-595.
- Michel, Dom Virgil. The Liturgy of the Church. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937.
- Morse, H. K. Elizabethan Pageantry. New York: B. Blom, 1969.
- Nagler, A. M. The Medieval Religious Stage. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Neill, Michael. "'Anticke Pageantrie': The Mannerist Art of Perkin Warbeck." Renaissance Drama n.s., 7 (1976): 117-150.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Moral Artifice of 'The Lover's Melancholy.'" English Literary Renaissance, 8 (1978): 85-106.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Wits most accomplished Senate': The Audience of the Caroline Private Theatres." Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 18 (1978): 341-360.
- Nelson, Charles. Renaissance Theory of Love. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.
- Nelson, R. J. Play within a Play. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
- New, John F. Anglican and Puritan. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Novarr, David. "'Gray Dissimulation': Ford and Milton." Philological Quarterly, 41 (1962): 500-504.
- Oliver, H. J. The Problem of John Ford. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1955.
- Ollier, F. Le Mirage Spartiate. Paris: 1933.

- Ong, Walter J. "From Allegory to Diagram in the Renaissance Mind: A Study in the Significance of the Allegorical Tableau." Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism, 17 (1959): 423-440.
- Orgel, Stephen. The Illusion of Power. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Strong, Roy. Inigo Jones. 2 volumes. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Panofsky, Erwin. Studies of Iconology. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Parrott, T. M., and Bull, R. H. A Short View of Elizabethan Drama. New York: Scribner's, 1943.
- Prest, Wilfred. The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972.
- Rawson, Elizabeth. The Spartan Tradition in European Thought. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Reynolds, G. F. The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull theatre, 1605-1625. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1966.
- Ribner, Irving. "By Nature's Light: The Morality of 'Tis Pity She's a Whore.'" Tulane Studies in English, 10 (1960): 39-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Righter, Ann. Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play. London: Chatto & Windus, 1962.
- Rist, J. M. Stoical Philosophy. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969.
- Ristine, Frank H. English Tragi-Comedy: Its Origin and History. New York: Columbia University Press, 1910.
- Roberts, Jeanne A. "John Ford's Passionate Abstractions." Southern Humanities Review, 7 (1973): 322-332.

- Rosen, Carol C. "The Language of Cruelty in Ford's 'Tis Pity She's a Whore.'" Comparative Drama, 8 (1974-5): 356-368.
- Rossiter, A. P. English Drama from Early Times to the Elizabethans. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950.
- Sandbach, F. H. The Stoics. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1975.
- Sargeaunt, M. Joan. John Ford. New York: Russell & Russell, 1966.
- Saxl, Fritz. "Pagan Sacrifice in the Italian Renaissance." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 2 (1939): 346-367.
- Schoenbaum, S. Renaissance Drama I: Essays Principally on Masques and Entertainment. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Sensabaugh, G. F. "Love Ethics in Platonic Court Drama, 1625-1642." The Huntington Library Quarterly, 1 (1938): 277-304.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Tragic Muse of John Ford. Stanford. Stanford University Press, 1944.
- Sherman, S. P. "Ford's Contribution to the Decadence of the Drama." John Fordes Dramatische Werke. Edited by W. Bang. Reprint. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1963.
- Sisson, C. J. Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1936.
- Smith, A. J. "The Metaphysic of Love." Review of English Studies, 9 (1958): 362-375.
- Smith, Hal H. "Some Principles of Elizabethan Stage Costume." Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes, 25 (1962): 240-257.
- Smith, Irwin. Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse. New York: New York University Press, 1964.
- Spencer, Theodore. Shakespeare and the Nature of Man. New York: Macmillan, 1949.

- Sprunger, Keith L. The Learned Doctor William Ames: Dutch Background of English and American Puritanism. Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1972.
- Spurgeon, Caroline. Shakespeare's Imagery. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1966.
- Stavig, Mark. John Ford and the Traditional Moral Order. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- Stirling, Brents. Unity in Shakespearean Tragedy. New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1966.
- Strong, Roy. Splendour at Court. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The English Icon. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited, 1969.
- Stroup, T. B. Microcosmos. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1965.
- Sutton, J. "Platonic Love in Ford's The Fancies, Chaste and Noble." Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 7 (1967): 299-309.
- Tigerstedt, E. N. The Legend of Sparta in Classical Antiquity. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, Uppsala, 1974.
- Ure, Peter. "Cult and Initiates in Ford's Love's Sacrifice." Modern Language Quarterly, 11 (1950): 298-306.
- Vlasopolos, Anca. "The Ritual of Midsummer: Pattern for A Midsummer Night's Dream." Renaissance Quarterly, 31 (1978): 21-29.
- Weathers, Winston. "Perkin Warbeck: A Seventeenth Century Psychological Play." Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900, 4 (1964): 217-226.
- Webber, Joan. The Eloquent "I". Madison, Milwaukee, London: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- Welsford, Enid. The Court Masque. New York: Russell & Russell, 1962.

- Wenley, R. M. Stoicism and Its Influence. New York: Cooper Square Publishers Inc., 1963.
- Wickham, Glynne. Early English Stage 1300-1660. 2 volumes. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959-1963.
- Williams, Sheila. "The Lord Mayor's Show in Tudor and Stuart Times." The Guildhall Miscellany, 10 (1959): 3-18.
- Wind, Edgar. Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968.
- Withington, Robert. English Pageantry: An Historical Outline. New York: B. Blom, 1963.
- Young, Karl. The Drama of the Medieval Church. London: The Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Young, Stark. "On Wearing Costumes." Theatre: Essays on the Arts of the Theatre. Edited by Edith J. R. Isaacs. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1968.



APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Chikako D. Kumamoto has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Anthony LaBranche, Director  
Associate Professor, English, Loyola

Dr. Suzanne Gossett  
Associate Professor, English, Loyola

Dr. Bernard McElroy  
Associate Professor, English, Loyola

Dr. James Rocks  
Associate Professor, English, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

20 Apr. 1982  
Date

Anthony LaBranche  
Director's Signature